The Higher Critics Criticised

THE

Higher Critics Criticised.

A Study of the Pentateuch For Popular Reading,

BEING AN INQUIRY INTO THE AGE OF THE SO-CALLED BOOKS OF MOSES, WITH AN INTRODUCTORY EXAMINATION OF DR. KUENEN'S "RELIGION OF ISRAEL"

BY

RUFUS P. STEBBINS, D.D.

WITH PRELIMINARY CHAPTERS ON

THE HIGHER CRITICISM

AND AN APPENDIX CONCERNING

THE WONDERFUL LAW,

By H. L. HASTINGS

Editor of "THE CHRISTIAN," *Boston, U.S.A.*

SCRIPTURAL TRACT REPOSITORY

H. L. HASTINGS
BOSTON, MASS., NO. 47 CORNHILL

MARSHALL BROS., AGTS.
LONDON, 5A PATERNOSTER ROW, E. C.

Copyrighted 1895

All Rights Reserved

[PRINTED IN AMERICA]

22500-a.a.1

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
COPYRIGHT
MAY 9 1895
CITY OF WASHINGTON

BS1225
.S7
1895

HIGHER CRITICS CRITICISED—2M,—4-'95.
REPOSITORY PRESS, BOSTON, MASS.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

THE

HIGHER CRITICISM.

BY H. L. HASTINGS,

He who made man, made him intelligent, and gave him the power to perceive, to compare, and to reason. Consequently all men have, to a greater or less extent, the ability to examine and decide concerning matters which affect their interests. This God-given power of examination is the source and foundation of what we call criticism.

The field of criticism is world-wide, and stretches through the ages. Everything on earth is liable and subject to just criticism. Of course there are matters which are not worth a critical thought; and there are also other matters concerning which men should offer criticism with care and respect. A prisoner at the bar would not be expected to criticise the law under which he was tried, or the judge by whom he was to be sentenced, with as much freedom as a man at liberty would criticise some passing circumstance, or some unsupported statement; for the fact that certain principles had been embodied in legal enactments, would be evidence that they had already been to some extent examined and discussed, and that they were not merely the casual utterances of a single individual.

There is perhaps no more important field for criticism than that which is afforded by the Sacred Books which have come to be regarded in various quarters as of superhuman origin and divine authority. These books, whether in India, China, or elsewhere, whether written in Sanscrit, Chinese, Hebrew, Greek, or Arabic, make such demands upon the faith and obedience of men, that it is an obvious duty to scrutinize their claims, and refuse to admit them unless they are solidly established. The critical examination of such documents comprehends various departments. First, there

is the careful study of the documents themselves, as translated into the common speech of the common people. Second, there is the critical study of the original records from which these translations were made. Third, there is the investigation of the history, and the record of the transmission of these documents, which involves the tracing of them from age to age to demonstrate their authenticity or spuriousness. Fourth, there is another form of criticism which aims to determine from internal evidence, the origin, date, authorship, and reliability of such documents as are submitted to its test.

All these forms and methods of criticism are legitimate; all are useful; all have their advantages; and all are liable to abuse and misconception. Hence while the right of criticism is undoubted, and the duty of criticism is imperative, yet it is important that we carefully guard against the abuse of things which in themselves are right, proper, and important.

It therefore appears that the field for criticism is very wide; and persons who have critical tastes have abundant opportunity for the exercise of their abilities. There are many books which come to us claiming great authority, and which are so vast in extent that scholars might spend their lives in their investigation. For instance they might examine the Rig Veda, the foundation of Brahminism, containing ten hundred and twenty-eight hymns, averaging ten stanzas each. They might extend their examination to the Code of Manu, comprised in some twenty big law books, and dating back to B. C. 400 or 500. They might investigate the story of Rāmāyana, that most sacred poem of 24,000 verses, of which it is said whoever reads or hears it will be freed from all sin. They might examine the Mahā-bhārata, a poem of 220,000 lines, or seven times as long as the Iliad and Odyssey combined, a copy of it filling eight good sized volumes. Or they might turn, for a change, to the Upanishads, "the kernel of the Vedas," a series of mystical Hindu books "that no man can number;" one hundred and fifty of which have been catalogued, some of them comprising hundreds of pages. Or they might study the Puranas, or Hindu traditional stories, which date from A. D. 600 down, of which there are eighteen Maha or principal Puranas, containing 1,600,000 lines, and other minor Puranas, containing about as many more. There were, the Hindu sages tell us, a billion of lines, but the rest were mercifully kept in heaven for home consumption!

Having examined all these sacred books, which are held by their votaries to be far superior to anything contained in the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures, they might turn to the Chinese Cyclopedia of Ancient and Modern Literature with its 6,109 volumes,

including eighteen volumes of index; and having spent six or eight years learning the ten thousand different Chinese characters in common use, and fifteen or twenty years in learning to read the language fluently, they might, with the aid of the latest Imperial Dictionary, containing 43,960 characters, go through these publications, and subject them to the crucial tests of the Higher Criticism. When this was done they might visit the British Museum and turn their attention to the Jangyn, or Cyclopedia of Thibetian Buddhism,—a delightful little work comprised in 225 volumes, each two feet long, and six inches thick. These,—which are held to be fully equal, if not superior to, the Hebrew Scriptures, by some of the skeptics of the present day who know little of either,—would furnish a very inviting field for the exercise of the critical faculty. And so long as the vast multitudes of China, India, and Thibet accept and embrace these wonderful productions, receiving them with unquestioning faith, it would certainly seem quite proper for men of critical and philanthropic inclinations to investigate the pretensions of these remarkable volumes, and inform the multitudes who accept them as to their authenticity, inerrancy, and authority.

When the precise character of all these sacred writings shall have been ascertained and definitely determined, their dates being assigned and their authorship established; when the writings of Confucius and Zoroaster have been inspected; when the Zend-avesta, the Korán, and the book of Mormon have all passed the crucial test of the Higher Criticism, it may then be well to direct attention to the lost literature of past ages; the acres of Egyptian hieroglyphics inscribed upon the walls of hidden tombs and ruined temples; the cuneiform inscriptions of ancient Persia; the records of the Babylonians and the Hittites, from which the mists of ages are slowly clearing; and the vast mass of Assyrian literature which has come to us from the ruins of Nineveh the buried city. And when these records are thoroughly investigated, and compared with the unwritten traditions of every heathen land beneath the sun, and their position thoroughly established by the "consensus" of the critics of our times, we shall then be prepared for a comprehensive and comparative view of the religions of the world, and the Sacred Books whence men derive their ideas of supernatural revelation.

It is a remarkable fact that the Higher Critics of the present day have hitherto failed to thoroughly explore these vast and inviting fields, but have mainly devoted their attention to the examination and discussion of sixty-six *little, insignificant pamphlets,*

the sacred literature of a small, isolated, scattered, and persecuted nation, which in numbers is positively insignificant in comparison to the vast multitudes which accept the voluminous sacred books we have mentioned. And it is a somewhat remarkable fact that this mighty mass of Assyrian, Babylonian, Chinese, Hindu, and Thibetian sacred literature escapes criticism, and sometimes receives actual commendation, while the only documents which are especially criticised, and whose errancy and mythical and unhistorical character is pointed out with unsparing zeal, are the records and laws of a nation which has had no political existence for nearly two thousand years, which does not control or possess a government, a city, a country, or even an island on the face of the earth. Why *this* book, of all others, should be subjected to such criticism as no other book has ever endured, and why this must run the gauntlet and receive the blows of friends and foes, while a vast mass of sacred oriental literature passes unnoticed and unscathed, is a phenomenon which baffles the comprehension of ordinary minds.

But we have to deal with existing facts; and as the Higher Critics of the present day do not trouble themselves to explore, dissect, and subject to microscopic examination the sacred writings, traditions, and theories of the hundreds of millions which compose the vast majority of the human family; and as they do not trouble themselves to point out the inconsistencies, discrepancies, and errancies of those books, we are limited to a much narrower range in the consideration of the performances of the Higher Critics whose sphere of action is by their own choice thus circumscribed and limited.

The fact that these critics have themselves learned all they know of criticism and science, in schools, colleges, and universities which exist only under the light and influence of this Book; and that most of them depend for the leisure they enjoy, the libraries they explore, the salaries they receive, and the bread that they eat, upon foundations and institutions endowed by men who loved and reverenced these very writings; might itself inspire a degree of reverential deference for such venerable documents; and the fact that these same critics, if born in any land where these writings are unknown, might have been exposed in the fields, flung out into the city streets, or drowned in the nearest horse-pond before they had time to criticise anything, would seem at least a sufficient reason why they should undertake with candor and respectful consideration the examination of a Book, to the influence of which they may owe their very existence, or without which they

might to-day have been howling and whirling in some circle of Dervishes, or sitting besmeared with cow dung on the banks of the Ganges, and seeking purification and salvation amid the obscenities and idolatries of heathen lands.

The work of criticising such writings is not to be rashly undertaken. It is an occupation for men who speak the words of truth and soberness. These records are hoary with age. They have survived the wreck of nations and empires. They have been and still are regarded with reverence, not merely by ignorant and degraded races, the worshipers of idols and the regarders of fetishes, but by the most intelligent and intellectual peoples on the face of the earth. The only nations which at the present time stand in the forefront of the world in art, in science, and in literature, are the nations which have read and cherished these books. They have entered into the civilization, the literature, and the jurisprudence of the civilized world; and it is impossible now to find a nation noted for art, invention, science, and progress, which has not paid reverence to these books.

These books are also as a literary phenomenon worthy of special consideration. Other nations have their sacred books, and keep them. The writings of Mohammed, or Confucius; the teachings of Buddha and Zoroaster; the Vedas and other sacred writings of the Hindoos, have never been translated by their own disciples into the languages of the world. To translate them would be to degrade them and destroy their efficacy. If we have the Koran of Mohammed in our own tongue it is because some Christian has translated it. If we have the sacred books of India it is because some man, trained under the light of the Scriptures, has taken the trouble to present them in an English dress. If we have the teachings of Confucius we must thank, not his disciples, but the disciples of Jesus of Nazareth for bringing them to our notice. But this book has been translated, printed, and disseminated, as no other book has ever been. Hence a book so remarkable, so unique in its character and position, while it is subject to the most searching criticism, is not to be regarded as a new or strange or untried volume, but as one which has lived in the blaze of investigation for two millenniums; which has fought its way through the storms and convulsions of ages and generations; and has maintained its position in the face of all attacks and oppositions, until after having endured ten times as much assault, resistance, and criticism as any other book that ever was made, we have to-day ten times as many of them in existence as of any other book that ever was printed.

These facts do not exempt the book from critical examination, but they should ensure it a decently respectful treatment at the hands of candid and impartial critics; and they should serve as a caution to persons who suppose that every question concerning this book can be settled at short notice and with little difficulty. For a book which has held its way and maintained its position for so many centuries, is not likely to be disposed of by a sneer or demolished by a pamphlet. The man who undertakes the work of criticism in the spirit of rashness and self-confidence, may well remember that he who girdeth on the harness is not to boast like him that putteth it off; and the man who in a more reverent spirit supposes that he has mastered this entire subject, may yet learn that there are in it judgments which are unsearchable, and ways which are past finding out.

There are signs of the existence of a mortal fear among some of the younger students of theology, that in the rapid progress of scientific criticism they may be left behind. They have heard about Galileo and Copernicus, the decrees and anathemas of councils, bulls against comets, and similar instances of "religious" bigotry, until,—forgetting that these were simply instances of old science disputing the claims of new science, a phenomenon which occurs continually,—they have determined that nobody shall get the start of them in the race of modern scientific investigation. Hence, whatever assertions or demands a scientist or critic may make, they hasten to accept his statements and obey his behests. But this plan of unconditional surrender may be carried too far; and when men believe everything which scientific men have guessed at, and admit and endorse the vagaries of scientific visionaries, before even their authors and inventors are satisfied of their truth, they remind one of the mythical coon which Davy Crockett treed, and which, on learning who the hunter was, said, "Colonel, you need not fire, I will come down." It is not best for men to part with their common sense or lose their balance for fear of being laughed at a thousand years hence. It is safe to hasten slowly. Everything that can be shaken will be shaken, but some things that cannot be shaken will remain; and it is possible that there will be, after all the whirlwinds of criticism, some things which cannot be shaken; and the only way to find out what they are is to wait, and investigate and see.

A story is told of a lunatic who, finding his way into a crowded church and grasping one of the pillars supporting the gallery said, "I am going to pull the house down!" Timid women screamed and shouted; but an old minister calmed the tumult by calling

out, "Let him try! let him try!" So there are men who are perfectly willing to have the critics try their hands at the Bible, and will abide the results. If they can grind it to powder let them do so: if they grind themselves to powder it will only be another instance of the rat gnawing the file.

But if men wish their theories admitted they must prove them; if they wish their ideas accepted they must show that they are worthy of all acceptation. There are critics who talk very loudly against the infallibility of others, and of course such persons can make no claim to infallibility for themselves; and there are persons who have had such acquaintance with the Scriptures that they will not lightly abandon the faith on which their souls have been stayed. They have been ready to give to every man a reason for the hope that is within them, and they have a right to demand that those who would unsettle their confidence should give them abundant evidence for their new position.

One thing somewhat perplexing to the average mind, is the air of semi-omniscience with which this whole subject of Biblical Criticism is discussed in certain quarters. We are assured that "all thinkers" think thus and so; that "all leading minds" have reached certain conclusions; that "there is no dispute among learned men" about these matters. But if the whole subject be so plain that it is beyond question in the minds of the learned, they must be able first, to come to an agreement among themselves, and second, to bring the facts and arguments on which they rest their conclusions to the understanding of candid men of average intelligence and studious habits. If a thing is demonstrably true, then its truth can in some way be shown. Ordinary people wish for argument, not authority. They are not so positive that "all learned men" are agreed upon this matter; nor are they entirely certain that all these eminent critics are agreed among themselves; and they are not so anxious to know *what* certain wise men believe, as they are to know *why they believe it.*

This desire seems to be reasonable and proper, and any man who sets himself up as an authority in these matters, should be able not only to state his position, but also to defend it, and that by arguments which are appreciable, and can be grasped by the common mind.

There are those who believe that they are forbidden to call any man master, or to take the unsupported assertions even of learned men without a question. They admit that learned men have great advantages, and are worthy of great respect; but they have never known that learned men were entirely exempt from prejudice and

error. In all the contentions existing among different classes of Christian people, they have found men of no small learning arranged in opposition to each other; and it is only a mark of common prudence to insist upon knowing, so far as possible, some of the facts on which such tremendous conclusions are based.

Moreover it has come to pass within the last few years, that many positions taken by "learned men" have been distinctly repudiated by other men equally learned; and in many cases new discoveries have shown that with all their learning these men were ignorant of many important facts. The spade of the explorer has sometimes played havoc with the lofty assertions of scholarly men, who have often proved themselves far from infallible. They have presented theories which they could not prove, but which subsequent investigations have disproved. Their insuperable objections have melted away in the light of extended research. Among themselves they have propounded theories variant and self-contradictory, and they are to-day full of disagreement and dispute; and their conclusions concerning things which they regard as settled may yet require revision. Intelligent and candid people are prepared for discovery, suggestion, proof, and argument, but they are not disposed to yield the whole matter in dispute because somebody says they must, or because "all the learned" have agreed upon it. They have their doubts whether learning is confined to one particular school of thought. They admit that they may be in error, but if so, they ask to be instructed, not commanded. They are willing to listen to advice, but are not prepared to accept assertions as authority beyond which no man can go. Hence they wait, not merely till learned men decide what the truth is, but till learned men are able to show that truth to other people in an intelligible and convincing form. They have become enamored of the Great Teacher of whom it was said, "Never man spake like this man," and yet, "The common people heard him gladly." If Jesus of Nazareth was utterly mistaken about the writings and authority of Moses and the prophets, they wish to know it; and they wish to understand precisely in what light this Great Teacher may be regarded. Many have nothing to hinder them from accepting truth whatever it may be. They are bound by no creed, and have sworn no adherence to any confession of faith. They have no pecuniary interest in declaring certain opinions, and are under no constraint, while believing one thing in private, to teach another in public. They have not even accepted a creed "for substance of doctrine," reserving the right to believe what they please concerning the subjects to which it refers. They have renounced the

hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the Word of God deceitfully, but by the manifestation of the truth they would commend themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God. They are, therefore, prepared to hear the truth, embrace it, and confess it. They have no fear of sacrificing office, position, or salary by frankly declaring their faith and hope; for they have already sacrificed such things, and counted them as loss and dross. They do not stand in awe of great men, nor fear to embrace new ideas; but they do insist on knowing what they believe, and why they believe it, and in having such a knowledge that they can tell it to others plainly, and openly, not with bated breath, guarded phrase, and studied circumlocution; but they wish frankly to say what they have to say, and not feel obliged to explain it away or take it back to avoid unpleasant consequences. Such men desire to know what they believe, and whereof they affirm. To tell them that the Rev. Professor this one, or the Rev. Doctor that one, and all the learned Rabbis have agreed and settled the matter, is so much wind. The question is not *who?* but *why?* and they wish for sound arguments and solid facts, rather than great authorities and big names.

It is not needful to go wild with panic over the results of the Higher Criticism, or of any other criticism. If these gentlemen throw away half or two-thirds of the Bible, there will still be more left than most people are likely to study carefully or practice faithfully; and besides if half the books of the Bible can be thrown overboard, it will save a large amount of labor for those expositors who spend so much time trying to prove that the book does not mean what it says, nor say what it means; and there will be quite as much consistency exhibited in rejecting the writing, as there is in accepting it, and then perverting its sense.

There are men whose knowledge of the things of God is not dependent entirely upon books or critics. They know Whom they have believed, and they are not likely to be 'stampeded' by any criticism that may be offered, whether constructive or destructive. "He that believeth shall not make haste." Inertia is said to be one of the properties of matter. It is probably also one of the properties of mind. Large bodies move slowly, and sometimes do not move at all. The best of men, with the best of causes and the clearest of arguments, have sometimes found that trying to change the minds of the mass of a community is much like kicking a dead elephant; and men who have no higher mission than to pull the Bible to pieces, may find that the old book will stand a deal of rough usage, and not be much the worse of wear. And

such is the inherent vitality and power of this Word, that men have been known to have been saved and utterly changed in heart, and life, and aim, by a single sentence from that book, or by a single chapter or verse. The most destructive of the critics will perhaps leave us as much as that; or possibly we shall keep it, whether they leave it or not; for, that there is something in that Book which lays hold upon the human mind, and conquers and subjects the human heart, seems evident even from some of the critics themselves, who, after they have definitely asserted that the book is mostly a forgery and a deception, full of errors and falsehoods, go right on reading and preaching it, and drawing their salaries for so doing, and saying it is the best book in the world, and contains the revelation of God to man. Blood is thicker than water, and common sense and conviction are sometimes mightier than criticism.

It must also be remembered that we are not dealing with a single book, but with sixty-six different books. The only way to confute them is to take them one by one. They stand together it is true, but they do not necessarily fall together; and if fifty of them in the crucible of the Higher Critic vanish like the baseless fabric of a vision, there are sixteen left, and they will be enough to take us through; so that if the hurricane of Higher Criticism blows away the masts, sails, and rigging, the old ship may still outride the storm, be able to pick up some of the drowning critics, and make her port under a jury mast. Hence the prospect seems very hopeful. Let our good friends the Higher Critics work away. If they can eat the Bible up, then we are better off without it, and if it really proves to be a file, they will know it when they see a heap of white powder beside it.

The sublime assurance with which some modern critics announce their judgment concerning the origin, authorship and authenticity of the Holy Scriptures, implies the possession of great self-confidence, if not absolute omniscience. They speak as if the questions under consideration were definitely settled, and as if only the ignorant, prejudiced, and bigoted, could for a moment presume to question the soundness of their conclusions, or the accuracy of their assertions. Thus questions of vast importance and wide-reaching interest are decided with an assumption of infallibility or inerrancy, which ordinary mortals scarcely dare to claim. And all this is done in the name of Higher Criticism, and exact Biblical science, by men whose greatness is supposed to be so manifest that the very mention of their names should awe people into silence and submission.

When the question was raised, whether modern Assyriologists had really found the key to the Cuneiform writings of Nineveh and Babylon, a method was devised by which the matter could be tested. In March, 1857, Mr. Fox Talbot sent to the Royal Asiatic Society, in a sealed packet, his translation of a cuneiform inscription on a cylinder containing about a thousand lines, which had been lithographed by Sir Henry Rawlinson, and which bore the name of Tiglath Pileser I. As Sir Cornewall Lewis had questioned the accuracy of these Assyrian translations, Mr. Talbot suggested to Sir Henry Rawlinson the making of separate and independent translations of this particular inscription. His own translation was already made and sealed. Sir Henry Rawlinson, Rev. Edward Hincks, D. D., and Dr. Julius Oppert, of the University of Bonn, were each requested to make a translation of the same inscription. It was agreed that they were not to communicate with each other in any way concerning the translation, and each was to forward his translation under seal, to be opened by a committee of Fellows of the Royal Asiatic Society, consisting of Dean Milman, Rev. Dr. Whewell, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge; Professor H. H. Wilson, Sir J. G. Wilkinson the Egyptologist; and Mr. George Grote, the Historian.

The translations were duly made: the packets were opened by the committee; the separate translations were read and found to agree in their essential particulars, having only such slight variations as demonstrated their entire independence. This settled the question. The mystery of the long-lost Assyrian language was solved.

A TEST FOR THE HIGHER CRITICS.

Such a test as this commands the respect and confidence of thoughtful and intelligent men. And now, if a dozen of the more eminent Higher Critics of the present day could be shut up in separate cells, and fed like the Hebrew captives in Babylon upon pulse and cold water, or some diet favorable to bodily health and mental activity; furnished with Hebrew Bibles and Greek Testaments; and supplied with paper and pens, and ink and scissors, and paste-pots and brushes, and deprived of all access to the writings of German Theologians, English and American Higher Critics, and French infidels, back to Jean Astruc himself; and then could be told to stay where they were till each could settle the question of the authorship, authenticity, inspiration, and inerrancy of each part of the sacred Scriptures for himself; and to cut and slash, and criticise and examine, and sort and winnow, until they could give us at last the clean wheat: a Bible on which

we could rely in life, in death, and at the day of judgment:—then, when they had all finished their work, and the dozen books were produced for examination and comparison, we could tell whether they had really obtained the key of knowledge, or whether they had simply produced twelve specimens of literary patch-work and botch-work, which, when compared and combined, would furnish a theological crazy-quilt beside which Joseph's coat of many colors would be as plain as a Quaker dress pattern.

Will these gentlemen ever try the experiment? Perhaps not. Indeed it is hardly needful that they should do it. We have already had specimens of their work, and a more amazing tangle of inconsistencies and contradictions can hardly be found in ancient or modern literature. The old disputes concerning the authorship of the Iliad and the Odyssey, which some one summed up as having demonstrated that the poems were "*not* written by Homer, but by another man of the same name, and living at the same time and place," were lucidity itself, compared with the revelations of the Higher Critics concerning the origin and authorship of the sixty-six books of the Old and New Testament. There are plenty of people who may be unable to judge as to the correctness of the position occupied by any one of these learned critics, but there can be no possible difficulty about deciding that when each one of a dozen contradicts all the others, they cannot all be infallible; and here is the opportunity for the common reader to exercise a little common sense.

Meantime while learned men are waiting for the verdict, one poor, insignificant mortal has taken the trouble to keep tally for the Higher Critics, and give us a kind of census as well as a consensus, of their number and their doings. One need not be a great man or a critic to do that. Any one can count, and cut notches in a stick, even if he cannot play in the game; and so we have a list of the doings of a few of the Higher Critics, who are getting our articles of faith ready for us, and who propose to let us know in due time just how much Bible we are to be allowed to believe, and how much "inerrancy" there is about it, after the "unhistorical" portions are eliminated.

In the "*Methodist Review*" for March-April, 1891, page 265, the late learned and lamented editor, J. W. Mendenhall, D. D. LL.D., while speaking of "The intrusion of the hypothetical spirit in the investigation of Biblical Doctrines, and of the origin of Biblical Literature," thus illustrates the uncertainty of this scientific guess-work, by which certain critics have endeavored to determine infallibly the origin and authorship of the various books

of the Old and New Testaments, until, "where truth ought to be found as transparent as sunlight, we find it clouded and hidden in the thick net-work of rhetorical and fallacious theorizing."

"The extent to which theory has been applied to the date, composition, and authorship of the several books of the Bible is startling when viewed in its aggregate result. Without pretending to exhaust the list we submit the following as our summary of the theories that have been invented respecting each book of the Bible since the rise of the Tübingen school, and as showing the untrustworthiness of the results of the critics who assume to be investigators of the books. As to Genesis, we record 16 theories; Exodus, 13; Leviticus, 22; Numbers, 8; Deuteronomy, 17;—total on Pentateuchal books, 76. As to Joshua, 10; Judges, 7; Ruth, 4; 1 and 2 Samuel, 20; 1 and 2 Kings, 24; 1 and 2 Chronicles, 17; Ezra, 14; Nehemiah, 11; Esther, 6;—total on historical books, 113. As to Job, 26; Psalms, 19; Proverbs, 24; Ecclesiastes, 21; Song of Solomon, 18;—total on poetical books, 108. As to Isaiah, 27; Jeremiah, 24; Lamentations, 10; Ezekiel, 15; Daniel, 22;—total on the greater prophetical books, 98. As to Hosea, 13; Amos, 15; Joel, 18; Obadiah, 9; Jonah, 14; Micah, 12; Nahum, 10; Habakkuk, 13; Zephaniah, 9; Haggai, 6; Zechariah, 14; Malachi, 11;—total on Minor prophetical books, 144. Grand total of the theories respecting the Old Testament books, 539. The work of the theorist as regards the New Testament is equally comprehensive and instructive. As to Matthew, we discover 7 theories; Mark, 10; Luke, 9; John, 15;—total as to the gospels, 41. As to the Acts, 12. As to the epistle to the Romans, 15; 1 and 2 Corinthians, 18; Galatians, 11; Ephesians, 8; Philippians, 8; Colossians, 12; 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 9; 1 and 2 Timothy, 12; Titus, 6; Philemon, 4; Hebrews, 8;—total as to Paul's epistles, 111. As to James, 5; 1 and 2 Peter, 7; 1, 2, and 3 John, 13; Jude, 7; Revelation, 12;—total, 44. The number of theories applied to the New Testament books is 208. Adding to 539, we have a total of 747 theories applied to the biblical books since 1850, or within forty years. Of the 747 theories 603 are defunct, and many of the remaining 144 are in the last stages of degeneracy and dissolution."

"It will assist the reader in estimating the work of the critics to remember that nearly one hundred theories die annually, many of them never advancing beyond infancy, and others being stricken with leprosy as for the first time they have taken hold of the horns of the altar of the Lord. We have by no means recorded all the inventions of the critics since Baur's day, but we have given

enough to show that theory is the chief instrument of the critic. He does not always seek facts or truths, but is wedded to his hypothesis of the biblical question. Of the large number of theories here given no two of them agree, every one being distinct and separate from all the others. We have little doubt, if a correct enumeration of the theories that have been proclaimed during the last forty years could be obtained, it would be found to *exceed two thousand*, for we suspended our examination long before the end had been reached. In these startling facts the orthodoxist finds abundant reason for refusing to follow the leadership of men whose chief business is to contradict truth, fact, history, and the fundamental principles of the Christian religion, with no stronger warrant than their own fancy or the limitations of their special education."

This, then, is a summary of the work of these learned critics, some of whom, smoke-dried and beer-sodden, handle the oracles of God with little reverence, and instead of trembling at His words, which shall judge them at the last day, seem to have no more respect for the messages of those whom God has set "over the nations, and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant" (Jer. i. 10), than they have for an erotic song of a licentious pagan poet, or some legend of heathen mythology. And these men, who contradict each other at every breath, and devour each other's theories as fast as they are born; ask us to accept assertions without facts, arguments without proofs, and crude speculations unsustained by historical testimony; and seek to unsettle our faith in those sublime and awful "Scriptures of truth" which have plowed their way through ages and centuries, leaving the mighty demonstrations of their divine authority and omniscient foresight in the desolations of Nineveh, the ruins of Babylon, the destruction of Tyre, the degradation of Egypt, the downfall of Jerusalem, the dispersion of Israel, the decline and fall of mighty Rome; and in hundreds of instances where history answers to prophecy as the mirrored likeness answers to the human face;—and they expect men to leave their anchorage, slip their cable, and go drifting out upon an unsounded sea of vague speculation, wild hypothesis, misty theorizing, and uncertain assertion, there to float rudderless, and without chart or compass, into regions of fog and darkness, of skepticism and unbelief.

Out of such a chaos of critical conclusion it is not easy for the ordinary mind to recall or remember anything. We therefore copy from the New York *Independent* a summary of "the generally

accepted views of progressive Old Testament scholars," giving "the literary results of advanced research in a nutshell," as presented in the new *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, by Prof. C. H. Cornill, of the University of Königsberg, who thus presents a

BIRD'S EYE VIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT WRITINGS ACCORDING TO THE RESULTS OF THE SPECIAL INTRODUCTION.

PERIOD BEFORE THE KINGS.

The song of Deborah.

THE EARLIEST PERIOD UNDER THE KINGS.

David's authentic Song of the Bow, II Sam. i. 19–27.
Solomon's authentic Temple Dedication Prayer, I Kings viii. 12–13 (LXX.)

PERIOD OF THE DIVIDED KINGDOMS.

Israel.	*Judah.*
The so-called Blessing of Jacob, Gen. xlix, 1–27.	
The Book of the Covenant, Exod. xxi–xxiii.	
The Book of the wars of Jehovah.	The Book of the Just.
THE ORIGINAL BALAAM PROPHECIES.	
The oldest Ephraimitic historical narratives, worked by E. into Judges and Samuel.	Jahvist J_1 in the time of Jehoshaphat, about 850.
Ephraimitic accounts concerning Elisha and Elijah embodied in I Kings xvii to II Kings xiii.	
The so-called Blessing of Moses, Deut. xxxiii; about 800.	
In the time of Jehoshaphat the following:	
About 760. Amos from Judah, but laboring in Israel exclusively.	
About 750, the great historical work of the Elohist.	*In the time of Uzziah and Jeroboam II the following:*
Hosea i–iii.	About 780, the anonymous Jewish prophet in Isa. xv–xvi, the oldest prophetic writing extant.
In the anarchy after the downfall of the Dynasty of Jehu the following:	
Between 738 and 735, Hos. iv–xiv.	*In the year of Uzziah's death* (735?) Isaiah's consecration as a prophet.
	From 735 to 722: Isa. vi, 1, 2, 3; ii–iv; v; ix, 7–10; iv, 17; vii; viii, 1–9; vi; xi, 1–9; i, 4–9; xviii–xxxii.
	Before 722: Micah i–iii.

AFTER THE DESTRUCTION OF SAMARIA, 722.

722, Isa. xiv, 28–32 (?).
Still in the time of Ahaz J_2 according to Budde; at any rate before 700.
The original Obadiah, according to Ewald.

IN THE TIME OF SARGON, 722–705.

Isa. xvi, 13, 14; [xxi, 11–17]; xx (from the year 711); x, 6–34; xiv, 24, 27, (?).

IN THE TIME OF SENNACHERIB.

Before 704, Isa. xviii; xxxix, 5–7.

Before 701, Isa. xxii, 15–25.

701, Isa. xxviii, 31; xxxvii, 6, 7 (?), 22–32; xxii, 1–14.

After 701, Isa. i, 10–17; xix.

Still in the times of Hezekiah (?), the Judean Temple narratives in II Kings xi–xii; xvi; xviii, 4, 14–16; and an account of the deliverance of the Temple and of Jerusalem, which is worked up in II Kings xviii, 17–19, 37; possibly also in I Kings, 6, 7 (?).

IN THE TIME OF MANASSEH.

Micah vi, 1–vii, 6.

Isa. lvi, 9–lvii, 13 (?); lix 3–16a (?).

About 650 E_2, a revision of E. by an Ephraimite who had remained in Palestine on the basis of the development of prophetic thought.

J, Union and harmonizing of J_1 and J_2 in the Primitive Narratives, and other younger Jahvistic and pre-Deuteronomic pieces.

Rj, Union and harmonizing of J and E; the second half of the seventh century being yet pre-Deuteronomic.

IN THE TIME OF JOSIAH.

About 630, Zephaniah.

627, Jeremiah's consecration as a prophet.

About 624, Nahum.

621, Proclamation of the original Book of Deuteronomy, which had been written a short time before, and the reform of the cultus based thereon.

Song of Hannah, I Sam. ii, 1–10, in the time of Josiah (?), but certainly pre-exilic.

IN THE TIME OF JEHOIACHIM.

Jer. xiii.

Psa. lxxxix (?).

597, Ezekiel banished together with the king.

IN THE TIME OF ZEDEKIAH.

592, Ezekiel's consecration as a prophet in Babylonia.

Before 586, Jer. xx, 7–18; xxi, 11–xxiii, 40; xxiv, xlix, 34–39; xxxii; xxxiii, 4–13.

AFTER THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

Jer. xxx–xxxi.

BABYLONIAN EXILE.

First Half.

About 580, Isa. xxiii.

October, 572, Composition and completion of the Book of Ezekiel.

April, 570, Addition of supplement to Ezek. xxix, 17–21.

The two separate editions and revisions of the original books of Deuteronomy by Dh and Dp.

Lamentations 2 and 4 younger than Ezekiel; 1 and 5 soon after.

Second Half.

The redaction of the great exilic historical work written in the spirit of Deuteronomy for the Pentateuch, Joshua and Judges by Rd. and for kings by Rd. (?).

P_1, The first systematic compilation of a priestly character.

Biographical parts of the book of Jeremiah, and practically the completion of the whole book.

Isa. xxi, 1–10 (and 11–17 ?).

Isa. xl–xlviii, between 546 and 538.

Isa. xiii, 2–14; xxiii; and xxxiv–xxxv, shortly before 538.

THE PERSIAN PERIOD.

After 538, Psa. cxxxvii (?).

After 536, Isa. xlix–lxvi.

September to December, 520, Haggai.

November, 520, to December, 518, Zech. i–viii.

About 500 P_1, written in Babylon.

Before 458, Malachi.

UNION OF P_1 AND P_2.

About 450, Aramaic history of the building of the Temple and the walls.

About 444, Proclamation of the priestly legislation, P_1+P_2.

After 444, Ezra's Memoirs.

After 432, Nehemiah's Memoirs.

About 400, Essentially completion of the Hexateuch by Rp.

Revision and excerpting of the Memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah by the author of Ezra x and Neh. viii, 1–ix, 5.

IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.

Final redaction of the historical books, Gen. xiv. Px in the Hexateuch, Rp. in Judges and Samuel.

Joel, probably after 400.

The canonical Obadiah, according to Hitzig in 312.

Jonah, Proverbs. } Probably from the Greek period.

The bulk of the Psalms from the time of the second Temple, and older than Chronicles.

Song of Songs (?).

THE GREEK PERIOD.

About 330, Isa. xxiv–xxvii.

About 300, The Chronicler; also, the author of the Ezra–Nehemiah book in its present form.

About 280, Zech. ix–xiv.

About 275, Translations of the Pentateuch into Greek; beginning of the LXX.

Before 250, Secondary and reproducing prophetic writings:

Isa. ii, 2–4; iv, 5, 6; xi, 10–xii, 6; xxxii, 1–8, 9–xxxiii, 24.

Jer. iii, 17, 18; v, 20–22; x, 1–16; xv, 11–14; xvii, 19–27; xxv, 30–38; xxxi, 35–37; xxxii, 17–23; xxxiii, 2, 3; l, i–li, 58.

Hos. i, 7; ii, 1–3; iii, 5; iv, 15a.

Amos ii, 4, 5; iv, 13; v, 8, 9; ix, 5, 6.

Micah iv, 1–4, 11–14; v, 1–3, 6–14, and ii, 12, 13; iv, 5–10; v, 4, 5; vii, 7–20.
Hab. ii, 9–20; 3 (?).
Zeph. iii, 14–20, and portions in chaps. ii and iii.
About 250, Completion of the prophetic canon.
Job, under all circumstances later than Proverbs.
204, Ecclesiastes, according to Hitzig.
The latest retouching of the historical and prophetic books on the basis of the Septuagint.

THE MACCABEAN PERIOD.

Psa. xliv; lxxiv; lxxix; and lxxxiii certainly.
January, 164, Daniel.
About 130, Esther.
About 100, Actual close of the Old Testament canon.

So much for "the literary results of advanced research in a nutshell."

It would be useless to criticise this re-arrangement of the Hebrew Scriptures, or to show that it was arbitrary, illogical, or erroneous, if we were able to do so; for the moment this was done another host of critics would start up with the reply that they had never endorsed any such arrangement as that, but had reached other conclusions widely different and equally reliable; and thus we should find ourselves in a maze of confused and contradictory theories, from which the Higher Criticism would afford us no way of escape.

With all the variations among the Higher Critics, the general sentiment is, that most, if not all, of the books of the Old Testament were written no one knows just when, where, or by whom; the only certain thing about their authorship being, that they were *not* written by the persons whose names they bear, nor at the times when they purport to have been written. Who their authors were their critics do not undertake to tell, nor do they produce the slightest evidence, historical or traditional, concerning their authorship. But we are invited to believe on their testimony as Higher Critics, that these writings, which have been guarded from generation to generation, and transmitted for many centuries by the Jewish nation, the Samaritans, and the Christian church; which have been the rallying center around which the scattered host of Israel have maintained their existence, in spite of all the persecutions and afflictions of ages; which have been the flaming pillar and the guiding cloud of the most progressive nations and races on the earth; and have thrilled and comforted the hearts of devout men for centuries and millenniums past; are really the production of certain anonymous, patriotic, and priestly scribblers, who forged

laws in the name of Moses, and prophecies in the name of the Most High God; who not only failed to sign their own names to things which they had written, but affixed to them the names of other famous men of preceding ages,—though why they selected *those men*, who had written nothing, and done nothing *down to that time*, to secure fame, and whose fame *now* rests, not upon anything they ever wrote or did, but upon the spurious acts and records which were forged and invented at that time,—is more than we can easily understand.

One thing is noteworthy; that is the persistent effort to bring down the date of these documents to modern times. In no single instance so far as known, is the age of a book declared by these critics to be greater than has been popularly supposed—invariably the date is brought down to more modern times.

What is the meaning of these persistent efforts to lower the date of all the ancient Hebrew writings? Why are these men so anxious to prove that all these books were written at dates so much more recent than has been ordinarily supposed? Why was it that Porphyry, the heathen philosopher, argued for the late origin of the book of Daniel? Why have skeptical writers been so anxious to prove that the art of writing was unknown in the time of Moses? Why have modern skeptics and rationalists devoted their energies to bringing down the date of these books? Are they trying to

PROVE THAT ALL PROPHECY IS A FABLE?

The religion of the Bible depends largely for its authority upon sacred prophecy. In this respect it differs from all other religions. The Old Testament constantly asserts the power of the Hebrew prophets to foretell future events; and this claim was not made in the interest of jugglers and fortune-tellers, who by occult arts professed to read and guess the future, but it was declared by men who claimed to be the servants and messengers of One who had supreme authority over human affairs; who ruled among the kingdoms of men; who had not only the wisdom to declare what should come to pass, but who had the might to bring to pass that which He had purposed; who declared that He worked all things according to the counsel of His own will, saying, "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure;" who declared "the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things which are not yet done," and who was supreme among the armies of heaven and the people on the earth. And the prophet challenges the gods and prophets of heathen nations to submit to *this one test*, to demonstrate before the eyes of the world that they had such power of

foresight as Jehovah possessed. Thus he says: "Produce your cause, saith the Lord; bring forth your strong reasons, saith the King of Jacob. Let them bring them forth, and *shew us what shall happen:* let them shew the former things, what they be, that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them; or *declare us things for to come. Shew the things that are to come hereafter,* that we may *know that ye are gods:* yea, do good or do evil, that we may be dismayed, and behold it together." Isa. xli. 21–23. "Behold the *former things* are *come to pass,* and new things do I declare; BEFORE THEY SPRING FORTH I TELL YOU OF THEM." Isa. xlii. 9. "Bring forth the blind people that have eyes, and the deaf that have ears. Let all the nations be gathered together, and let the people be assembled: who among them can declare this, and *shew us former things?* Let them bring forth their witnesses, that they may be justified: or let them hear, and say, It is truth. Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen: that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am He: before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I, even I, am the Lord; and beside me there is no saviour." Isa. xliii. 8–11. "The great God hath made known to the king what *shall come to* PASS HEREAFTER." Daniel ii. 45.

The whole story of the New Testament, and the proof of the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth, revolves around the expressions: "Thus it is written," and, "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets." The Saviour in the concluding days of His ministry rebuked His disciples as being "slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken;" and the apostles, in proving the Messiahship of the son of Mary, reasoned out of the prophets, and the Scriptures, saying none other things but those which Moses and the prophets did say should come to pass. Christianity therefore stands or falls with the truth of sacred prophecy, and the apostle solemnly enjoins upon us to "despise not prophesyings."

But prophecy in recent years has become greatly despised. The prophetic scriptures have been overlooked, and neglected, and the importance of prophecy has been belittled. A church goer from childhood to manhood declared to the writer that in all his life he had never heard a sermon on prophecy, and he was consequently a skeptic, though a member of the church. This neglect of scripture prophecy has been a virtual abandonment of one of the strongest lines of defense for the Christian faith. Persons have belittled its importance, and neglected it, and then the enemies of the gospel, quick to see their advantage, have endeavored to invalidate all argument from this source. Hence Porphyry asserted that the

prophecy of Daniel was written after the events predicted had transpired. The wish was father to the thought; and the recent drift of criticism, constantly laboring to *bring down the date of these ancient writings*, is believed to be not entirely in the interest of pure criticism, but rather to show that prophecy is a fable, and thus undermine this foundation on which rests the doctrine of the Messiahship of Jesus, and the truth of the gospel of Christ.

Of course an argument thus constructed would be entirely inconclusive to any well instructed student of the scriptures, for if we are to admit the *latest date* that is *claimed* by the wildest of modern critics for the origin of both the Old and New Testament writings, we should still have *prophecy fulfilling around us.* The predictions of Christ that His words should not pass away; that His gospel should be proclaimed in all lands; that Jerusalem should be trodden under foot of the Gentiles; that the Jews should be scattered among all nations; the predictions of Moses concerning the calamities that should overtake the Israelites if they disobeyed God; the prediction of Hosea that the children of Israel should abide many days without a king, without an altar and without a sacrifice; the predictions of Daniel concerning the Roman empire; after throwing out entirely all those passages which refer to events prior to the latest asserted date of the writings of Daniel; the predictions of the ruin of Babylon, the overthrow of Tyre, the desolations of Petra, and the degradation of Egypt, all of which were existing and flourishing long after every page of both Old and New Testament was written, still furnish us evidence of omniscient foresight and divine power, presiding over the destinies of nations, controlling the events of human history, and foretelling things that should come to pass hereafter; so that if we move the origin of the Scripture writings down to the latest possible date, we still have prophecies which are *now* being circumstantially accomplished, to which we can point and say, "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears."

The Higher Critics despise and discredit prophecy by asserting that the men who claimed to be the messengers of God were really pretenders, forgers of fables, and writers of fictitious books; and hence they make constant efforts to bring down the dates of the books of the prophets and sacred writers to a period subsequent to the events to which they referred, thus endeavoring to prove that prophecy is a fable; that no man has ever been inspired of God to foretell future events; whence it follows that Christianity is a fraud, and Jesus of Nazareth was not the promised Messiah, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world, and that no prediction for the future can be accepted or depended upon.

Doubtless persons enamored of the Higher Criticism will disavow all this, and deny that they admit any such conclusions. We are not concerned with *their* conclusions, which may be as illogical as their assumptions or their arguments; but they may be sure that others, accepting their arguments, *will reach these logical conclusions*, and renounce all faith in divine revelation, and in Christ the Saviour of sinners. Hence it becomes important at the outset to carefully examine the underlying principles which govern the action of these Critics, and to closely scrutinize their claims and pretensions.

The assaults on Christianity at the present day are not open and above-board, they are covered and insidious. The process of sapping and mining is going on. We are told that such an argument must be abandoned, but then we do not need it; that another position must be given up, but there are others that are so much stronger that it makes no difference. We are informed that "all the learned believe" this, and that "all the critics believe" that, and only a few belated, old time bigots maintain the "traditional view."

And yet there are men who had given thought and study to these questions before most of these Higher Critics were born, and who examined these difficulties when some of these learned gentlemen were in their swaddling clothes, and they are not at all certain that wisdom is likely to die with a lot of German Doctors who, over their pipes and beer, discuss and everlastingly settle these questions beyond the possibility of doubt or appeal, and make their conclusions the end of the law regarding this matter.

There are certain sympathetic elements essential to the highest criticism, and some of these elements are not possessed by all critics who take upon themselves to handle the Scriptures of truth, and who have never yet learned that a solemn reverence befits men who deal with those words that shall judge them at the last day. "To this man will I look, even to him that is poor, and of a contrite spirit, *and trembleth at My Word*." But there is another man of a very different class who is thus described: "He that killeth an ox, is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck; he that offereth an oblation, as if he offered swine's blood; he that burneth incense, as if he blessed an idol." Such men have little in common with the servants of God. "They have chosen their own ways, and their soul delighteth in their abominations. I also will choose their delusions, and will bring their fears upon them." Isa. lxvi. 2–4.

The musical critic must understand music; the art critic must know something of art; and he who criticises the Hebrew Scriptures should possess that Spirit by which their authors were moved to speak.

We are pleased to hear that many of the Higher Critics are men of blameless life and reverent spirit. We are thankful for the assurance. We shall be glad to know that they are able to stop when half way down Niagara; and that with them sentiment and education may be stronger than logic. But we are concerned not with the influence of certain opinions upon men who propagate them, but rather with their effect upon people *who hear them and are misled by them.* There are no doubt scholarly Gallios who hold their opinions so loosely and so calmly that they can think or say what they like, and yet maintain the reputable behavior in which they were trained by pious parents in years gone by; but there are others who have had no such training or culture, and it is important to know what *their* conclusions will be when they have learned that prophecy is "a cunningly devised fable," inspiration a vain pretense, and that the Scriptures are not merely the unreliable statements of erring, fallible men, but the *deliberate inventions*, falsehoods, and pious frauds of men who it would seem have regarded lying as a virtue, and forgery and deception as marks of special grace.

Possibly some persons interested in these critical studies may yet have to face other deeper and more serious questions than those which at present engage them. We are at present hearing what some of them say about the Bible; it is possible that we may hear later what the Bible says about them. They have freely told what they thought of the God of the Bible; and there may yet be an opportunity to know what the God of the Bible thinks of them. They have given us their opinion concerning the person and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth; perhaps, to change the subject, we may yet ascertain His opinion concerning them. It may not be difficult to learn it, for we have some records which might aid us in our investigations.

There was once a man who had the privilege of personal conversation with this Teacher concerning whose character men have disputed so much. He was a man who could read Hebrew without consulting lexicons or grammars; he knew it as our Higher Critics know their mother tongues. He lived nearly two thousand years nearer the times of the prophets than we do, he had access to older and more correct manuscripts of the Scriptures than we now have. He was familiar with Jewish traditions; and the public records and genealogies were open before him. He was skilled in Jewish law, so that with a single question he could sometimes break up the sitting of a whole Sanhedrim. He lived nearer the time when our Higher Critics tell us the canon of Scripture was closed, than we

do to the time of Christopher Columbus, or the Pilgrim fathers. He had opportunities for observation, and the privilege of personal acquaintance with many facts which are only transmitted to us through successive generations; and as the result of his observations and investigations, in the face of all the doubts, and questions, and cavilings of the learned and the captious of his time, he expressed his personal conviction that Jesus of Nazareth was "a teacher come from God," because no man could do the miracles which he wrought unless God was with him. But to this man, influential, prominent, learned, candid, and truthful, the Teacher of Nazareth said, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again." The wise man did not understand how these things could be,—it is doubtful if he understood entirely how he was born at first,—but his failure to understand did not at all invalidate the testimony of the Teacher, whose solemn words declared and enforced the necessity of a new birth, the beginning of a new life. It was not a question of the theories or opinions of Nicodemus, the Saviour found no fault with them; but there must be the beginning of a new life within the soul: he must be born of God.

Judging from the spirit, temper, and methods of some of the teachers and critics of the present day, a personal interview with the Saviour might bring to their knowledge the fact that they needed something more than correct opinions and Scriptural views, namely, to be "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God which liveth and abideth forever." "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." There are now as in ancient times, men who are "soulual, having not a spirit." Jude, 19. There are natural men who discern not the things of the Spirit, for they are foolishness with them; but there are also spiritual men who discern all things, and yet whose inward life is a mystery to those who have never known it. 1. Cor. ii. 14–15. The Christ of God was rejected and condemned by men who knew Hebrew from their infancy, while unlearned and ignorant men accepted the salvation that Jesus Christ proclaimed; and it may still prove to be the case that there are deeper secrets than those that are mastered by the critics of our time, and that of some important matters it may be said to-day, as of old, "Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight." Matt. xi. 25, 26.

We calmly await the results of honest investigation. Perhaps the Higher Criticism may yet get down so low that the common

people can examine it, and see what it is like. If certain books in the Bible are to go, there is this consolation, we shall have more left than most people heed. Perhaps if half the Bible is flung away, people will find time to study the other half. If the critics will leave us a little, say a Gospel, an epistle or two, and a few Psalms, it will be as much as many people read, and far more than they practice. Perhaps when our critical Sibyls have burned up two or three installments of the Book, the common people may learn the value of what remains. We hope the matter will be settled somehow soon. For several thousand years some thousands or millions of critics, more or less, have been working away at the Bible. Criticism is not peculiar to any age or land; it is not confined to Germany or to America. Even in the Garden of Eden there was a critic ready to say, "Hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" Gen. iii. 1. Jannes and Jambres, the wise men of Egypt in the days of Moses, were quite at home in that department of Higher Criticism which eliminates the supernatural and denies the miraculous; and they met with considerable temporary success, though their serpents were finally swallowed; their theories led those who accepted them into water beyond their depth; and their folly was made manifest, as that of others may yet be. Jehoiakim, with his penknife, was as free a critic as can easily be found at the present day; but after he had cut the prophecy of Jeremiah in pieces and flung it in the fire, it came back to him improved and amplified, and was eventually fulfilled. Jer. xxxvi. 23–32. Zedekiah was an acute critic; for while one prophet declared that he should go to Babylon and die there, and another informed him that he should not *see* Babylon, he, in the exercise of the critical faculty, concluded that since the prophets disagreed with each other, it was safe to disbelieve them both. But when Zedekiah was captured, his sons slain before his face, his eyes put out, and he taken to Babylon to die there, he learned that a man might go to Babylon and yet never *see* Babylon.*

Celsus the philosopher showed that Christianity was an absurdity, and his quotations from the New Testament stand now to confound the skeptics who deny the early origin of those books. Porphyry asserted that the prophecy of Daniel was a forgery, written after the events had occurred; but Porphyry is dead and buried, and the fulfillment of Daniel's prophecies is still going on. Diocletian, in 303, commanded to tear down the churches and

*Jeremiah xxxii. 4, 5; Ezekiel xii. 13. Josephus *Antiq.* Book x. chap. vii. § 2; chap. viii. § 2.

burn up the Scriptures; and struck a medal with the legend "Christianity is Destroyed;" but two years later he quit the emperor business, and went to raising cabbages. Julian, the apostate, assailed the new religion, and perished on the battlefield and sunk into oblivion. And from that time down there has been a succession of kings, princes, rulers, and ecclesiastics who have been working away to demolish the Bible, or restrict its circulation, and keep it from the people, till we come down to Voltaire, and Paine, and the smaller fry of critics who repeat their borrowed arguments.

The Christian Register for June, 1891, a paper fully alive to the merits, and quite in harmony with the methods and conclusions of the Higher Critics, says: "Thomas Paine, though stigmatized and set aside as an infidel, finds reincarnation in the modern Biblical critic. Paine pointed out the contradictions in the Bible, which rendered impossible the claim that it is an infallible book. He lived too far in advance of his age. The spirit of modern scientific criticism had not yet come. . . . And now it is interesting to find that with a different spirit, and with different tools, and bound by certain traditions from which Paine was free, the *professors in our orthodox seminaries are doing again the work which Paine did*, and like him in the interests of honesty and truth."

So the work goes on, and the woods are full of skeptics and critics with their wonderments about Noah's Ark, and Moses' coney, and Jonah's fish, and Abraham's burying ground, and heaven knows what else; and it now looks as if the job was likely to be finished once for all.

Well, we shall feel relieved when it is over, and we hope they will be quick about it. We want the matter settled somehow. If it is necessary to appoint a receiver for the old concern, let it be done, and let it go into liquidation and see what is left; only we hope that these great and learned men, who are hired and paid to tell people how much of the Bible they *may* believe, will make a clean job of it, finish it up once for all, and let us know just where we are. We want to get our assets into shape, so that we may know exactly how we stand. Will they leave us John iii. 16? or Matthew xi. 28? or Luke xv.? or Psalm xxiii.? or John xiv.? or 1 Cor. xv.? or Rev. xxi. and xxii.? What we want to know is, just what we can depend on, and just how we are coming out.

And then if we find ourselves short of Bible, we want to know on whom we shall draw to meet the deficiency. Shall we go to Confucius, or Buddha, or Plato, or Pythagoras? to Zoroaster, to Mohammed, or Joseph Smith? to the Rig Veda, or the Book of Mormon? to the Age of Reason, or the Light of Asia? Shall we

consult the 6,000 volumes of the Chinese Cyclopedia, with its eighteen volumes of index; or shall we examine the 225 volumes of the Jangyn, the pocket cyclopedia of Thibetan Buddhism? Of course we must not be left without something, and we wish to know definitely "*To whom we shall go*" to find "the words of eternal life?" We are tired of being unsettled, and if our learned critics will put their heads together and decide this whole business, once for all, we shall be relieved and feel thankful.

But they must not ask us to depend on authority when we drop the Bible. We cannot make a *fetish* of the new books of the Higher Critics. They must give us evidence, and demonstration, and must bring this evidence down where the common people can read and understand it; and if they will kindly agree among themselves, so that when one of them has settled everything no one else will come along next day and upset the whole, we shall be truly thankful. Especially would we be glad to have them tell us what they believe, and *why they believe it.* "Tell me what you believe, I have doubts enough of my own;" is a saying attributed to Goethe. These gentlemen have spent time enough telling us what they do *not* believe; now will they inform us what they *do* believe, and also why they believe it? They have showed us how to cut our cable: will they now tell us how to come to anchor, and where we are to find an anchorage ground?

Truth courts investigation. Candid men are not afraid to consider difficulties which occur in the Hebrew Scriptures; but when such difficulties are invented or exaggerated, they indicate the errancy of the critic rather than that of the Book he criticises. Intelligent, careful, honest criticism is legitimate and welcome; but carping skepticism is not legitimate criticism.

The phrase 'Higher Critic' is as indefinite as the term 'reptile,' which may be either a crocodile, a mud-turtle, a lizard, or a striped snake; or the word 'animal,' which may be a mouse, a mammoth, a pussy cat, or a Bengal tiger. So there are critics *and* critics, of every variety, from the mildest grade of perplexed doubters to the most out-spoken type of skeptics and unbelievers. Names and brands signify little now;—every parcel must be examined. Doubtless some of the Higher Critics are men of devout spirit and true faith, but they are in questionable company, and are, sowing seed which may produce an unlooked for harvest. They must not complain if men scrutinize or suspect them. Plain people are anxious to know just what the critics of the day are, and what they are doing. Are they Christians or infidels? Are they trying to pilot the old ship into port, or wreck it on the sand bars? Christians are quite

willing that critics should scrape off barnacles, but they are not ready to have them scuttle the ship: and it seems to be time for those in whom faith is not utterly dead, to watch the course of events, and stand for the defense of truths which are rashly assailed.

A survey of the various destructive, discordant, and self-contradictory theories of *some* of the Higher Critics, affords a degree of justification for the following words from a well known English paper:

"What is called the criticism of the Old Testament consists of a series of idle conjectures concerning the dates and the authorship of the books and of the various parts of them. The reason why these conjectures are put forth is this: That the 'critics' are infidels who want to overthrow religion by casting doubts on the Bible. Their efforts are concentrated on discrediting anything in the Bible which implies miracle or the supernatural. When future events are foretold, they say that the prophecy is a fraud, having been written after its alleged fulfillment. When God's miraculous dealings with man are narrated, the 'critics' set to work to show that the story is an embellished version of some purely natural occurrence. When the author declares that he himself was an eye-witness of the marvels he relates, the 'critics' say the work is a late forgery. Afterwards, when their guess-work has been proved baseless and their arguments torn to tatters, the 'critics' publish new books carefully ignoring all that has been urged against the old ones, and simply reaffirming dogmatically their former conclusions. Then certain weak-kneed Christians, deeply impressed with the audaciously positive assertions of the destructive school, hasten to accept them as the undoubted 'results of criticism.' They fly to church congress to 'warn' their brethren against the danger of disputing these 'results.' They wildly attempt the impossible task of 'serving two masters.' They imagine they can still remain Christians and still profess a reverence for the Bible as a whole, while accepting in detail the destructive theories of the rationalist school."

We must act prudently where such mighty issues are involved, and hasten slowly while doctors disagree so radically; calmly waiting until scores of critical theories have run their course, and their authors and their imitators are forgotten. We will read the Bible until something better comes. We will welcome all legitimate criticism, which brings light instead of darkness. We will scrutinize every book and every page. We will prove all things, and hold fast that which is good; and in so doing we believe that we shall still be found "holding fast the faithful Word," that we "may rejoice in the day of Christ" that we have "not run in vain, neither labored in vain." Titus i. 9; Phil. ii. 16.

JESUS OF NAZARETH AS A HIGHER CRITIC.

JESUS OF NAZARETH

AS

A HIGHER CRITIC.

BY H. L. HASTINGS.

It is probable that there is not a single fact stated in the entire Bible that is not questioned, controverted, or contradicted by some critic or skeptic. It is therefore necessary to examine, investigate, and settle every point. Nothing must be assumed, nothing taken for granted, and every claim of Christ or Christianity must be disregarded, until the entire status of the case is settled on the basis of exact scientific criticism. There are many who would settle critical questions by reference to the authority of Jesus of Nazareth; but the system of Higher Criticism goes to the roots of things, and declines to rest its conclusions upon the authority of any one. Of course a disciple of Christ might accept the testimony of Jesus of Nazareth, and ask no further evidence, but all men are not disciples of Christ, and with them "the testimony of Jesus," which is "the spirit of prophecy," has no weight.

There are men who may be described as "the contrary minded," who deny that Jesus of Nazareth ever existed. These, however, are not Higher Critics; their conclusions make so clean a sweep that there is nothing left to criticise; but with the Higher Critics in general, Jesus of Nazareth was a historic personage, and as such may be subjected to critical consideration. Some who accept Him as the Saviour of the world, yet believe that He was subject to "human limitations" that should qualify our estimate of the validity of His utterances concerning such matters as the authorship and authority of the Scriptures.

It is useless to find fault with these positions; this condition of things confronts us, we must therefore meet it; and if we are to come to any understanding with doubters and unbelievers, we must

put ourselves in their place, and consider Jesus of Nazareth, not as a divine being, but as a human being; not as God manifest in the flesh, but as the man Christ Jesus: not even as a prophet, but as one of many Jewish teachers who from time to time arose among the people.

Let us therefore consider Jesus of Nazareth in His human aspect, and with all the limitations which pertain to human life. And First: He was a Jew, of the tribe of Judah, of the stock of Abraham. He was not a Jew in exile or captivity, exposed to Gentile influences and foreign culture, but He was born and bred a Jew in the land of Israel, and surrounded by Jewish associations, influences, and family affiliations. Second: He was under the care of those who were bound by Jewish law to diligently teach Him its precepts. It is probable that the very first devotional poem which He ever read or learned testified of the happiness or blessedness of the man "whose delight is in the law of the Lord, and in His law doth he meditate day and night." Third: His knowledge of the Hebrew and Syriac tongue was not acquired under the weekly lessons of a Gentile professor during a three years' course in a theological seminary. He had been brought up where these tongues were the language of common life, and had learned them from his mother's lips. He was not in a land of uncultured barbarians: there were schools and books around Him. Foreign languages were also spoken, so that in the metropolis it was deemed necessary by the authorities to inform the passers by of the crime of an executed malefactor by inscriptions in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin.

Fourth: His knowledge of Jewish antiquities was not derived from books or libraries, but from personal acquaintance and investigation. His acquaintance with Jerusalem and Judea and the land of Israel, was acquired, not in a trip of two or three weeks, with a dragoman to ask his questions, a Turk to answer them, and a company of soldiers to keep him from being knocked in the head and robbed by wandering Bedawin; but he had probably made a hundred journeys to and from the Sacred City. Three times a year from the age of twelve till he began to be about thirty years old, he had gone up to appear in Zion before the Lord, and there had mingled with his countrymen who gathered from Dan to Beersheba. Herod's magnificent temple was standing, and there, on his first visit to Jerusalem, he had found his way in among the doctors, listening to them and asking them questions; and we may easily believe that in his later visits he improved similar opportunities. From time to time he also visited other portions of the land of Israel, traversing the hills and valleys, climbing the mountains,

skirting the shores and the borders of Gennesaret; mingling in the hum and tumult of the crowded city, and again turning aside into the desert to rest; traversing Judea, Galilee, and Samaria, and thus becoming acquainted with rabbies, teachers, scribes, and lawyers: venerable men who had devoted their lives to the study of their ancient records, and who were familiar with law, and learned in Hebrew lore.

Fifth: He had no occasion to hunt through lexicons, concordances, and grammars to master the mysteries of Hebrew lexicography, the subtilties of Hebrew grammar, or the idiomatic structure of the sacred tongue. There were men all around him who were experts in all these departments. There were priests and learned men who had read and spoken Hebrew, Syriac, and Chaldee all their days, and who were capable of pronouncing a critical judgment upon the style, idioms, archaisms, and peculiarities of any Hebrew document. They were men of deep research, patient application, subtile intellect, and great national pride. Every one of them by the aid of those "endless genealogies" which were kept on record, could trace his lineage back to the "father of the faithful." As priests, their position depended upon keeping the records of this lineage, and as citizens of the land their citizenship and the possession of their estates rested upon their ability to trace their lineal descent from those Hebrews who had entered the promised land. They had a considerable literature, and an abundance of traditions, both written and oral. They were as near the times of David and Solomon as we are to Alfred the Great. They were as near the times of Nebuchadnezzar and the Babylonian captivity, as the Englishman of to-day is to the times of William the Conqueror. They were as near the times of Malachi, Ezra, and Nehemiah as we are to the times of John Huss, Jerome of Prague, and Martin Luther. They were nearer the times assigned by the Higher Critics to the authors of much of the Old Testament, than we are to the times of Shakespeare and Milton, John Bunyan and Jeremy Taylor. They were in a little territory about as large as the State of Massachusetts, where for more than fourteen hundred years they and their fathers had lived continuously, with the exception of the brief period of the Babylonish captivity. Every hill and every valley of that region was historic. They needed no "Biblical Researches" to inform them concerning the localities and facts mentioned in Jewish history. Uncontradicted history and uninterrupted tradition had brought down the memories of the stirring events of past ages. They were as familiar with the mountains, the valleys, the monuments, and the battle fields of their native land as we are with

similar localities made memorable to us by events of by-gone years.

They did not know everything about the outside world, and did not explore distant lands while ignorant of their own. The world was smaller then than now; the telegraph did not bring its daily deluge of the gossip and garbage of the world to their tables. No printing-presses were tumbling out tons of ill-digested reading matter, and unreliable and sensational intelligence. No vast public libraries existed, out of which seventy-five per cent of the books taken were fiction; but they had their histories and their traditions, their proverbs and their songs, their laws and their parables; they had the genealogies of their families and the public records of the leading events of their time.

Trained under such circumstances and such influences, Jesus of Nazareth had great opportunities for familiarizing himself with the Semetic languages and literature. He was familiar with the Syriac tongue, the language of common life. He spoke it by the wayside, in the house, in common conversation, in secret prayer, in his dying agonies upon the cross.* He had undoubtedly read Hebrew at an age when most of the Higher Critics did not know the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet. He could stand up before a public assembly of Jews and read a Hebrew manuscript at sight, and pronounce his words correctly. How many Higher Critics could do that to-day? He had access to Hebrew manuscripts in all the synagogues in Palestine, besides copies in private hands, and every one of those manuscripts was *hundreds of years more ancient than any Hebrew manuscript which any Higher Critic ever saw or ever will see.* His discourses clearly indicate that he had diligently read those books, and was familiar with their contents. There are probably not more than a dozen Higher Critics on earth who would set themselves above Him in native abilities, mental grasp, and intellectual acuteness. He could sing, and preach, and pray in Hebrew as well as ordinary critics can in English or in German; and in all his references to the Hebrew Scriptures we do not recall a palpable error or a blunder; and upon purely literary grounds his position *as a critic must be infinitely higher than that of any man on earth to-day.* He was nearer the days of Ezekiel and Daniel than we are to the times of Wycliffe, our oldest translator of the Bible. He was nearer the time of the origin of large portions of the Scriptures, according to the Higher Critics, than we are to the Pilgrim Fathers, and about as

*For numerous instances of our Saviour's use of the Syriac language, see the writer's *Historical Introduction* to Dr. Murdock's *Translation of the Peshitto Syriac New Testament*, p. xxxi. Scriptural Tract Repository, Boston, Mass., 1893.

near to what they call the "actual close of the Old Testament canon" as we are to the Revolutionary War, and the battle of Bunker Hill.

It therefore follows, that *upon purely literary grounds*, Jesus of Nazareth, considered only as a Jewish teacher and critic, must stand *infinitely higher than any man who lives on earth to-day.* If the original writings of Moses had been as old as any man ever supposed them to be, they would not have been much older than the Sinaitic manuscript which Tischendorf obtained in the monastery of St. Catharine, and which is now in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg. A parchment manuscript written by Adam or Noah might, with a single transcription, have been easily preserved to the time of Jesus of Nazareth.

"The man Christ Jesus" was in a position to speak impartially concerning these matters. He was neither a Priest nor a Levite, and did not subsist upon the tithes and offerings of the people, and so had no pecuniary interests in the national religion. He was not a Scribe nor a Lawyer, nor was he a theological professor, bound by his position, his vows, or his salary to study the law and defend and proclaim it however he might doubt its authority. He was untrammelled by creeds, confessions, and sectarian bands. He was neither a Pharisee, a Sadducee, an Essene or a Herodian. He was of royal lineage, but he laid no claim to authority on that account. He was a plain, working man; his hands ministered to his necessities. He was able and willing to earn his living, and could afford to tell the truth: nor was he subject to Jewish traditions, or entangled in the cobwebs of antiquity. He refuted and condemned the traditions of the elders, by which the law of Moses was made void; but *he knew the Holy Scriptures.* He lived in a land where these books were held sacred, guarded with sedulous care; deposited in the temple and places of worship, and publicly read in the synagogues every sabbath day.

If therefore we may not cite the testimony of Jesus of Nazareth, the Messiah, the Son of God, perhaps we *may* ask the opinion of Jesus of Nazareth, the Higher Critic, who, from his acquaintance with Biblical antiquities, Hebrew idioms, and textual criticism, was *in a position to give lessons to every Higher Critic now on the face of the earth:* and whose personal independence, conscientious truthfulness, mental grasp, and intellectual acumen, give his words a weight not possessed by those of many of the critics of to-day.

Now what does Jesus of Nazareth, as a man, as a teacher, and as a Higher Critic say concerning the Old Testament Scriptures? He quotes from Psalm lxxxii. 6, as "*the Word of God,*" and informs us that "the Scripture cannot be broken." He lived a hundred

years nearer the time when the Higher Critics say the book of Daniel was forged, than we do to the time when the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock; and he could judge whether the prophecies contained in the book of Daniel had been forged after their accomplishment or fulfilled before they were written; but he boldly mentioned "Daniel the prophet," and pointed forward to the future fulfillment of predictions which at that time were not accomplished, saying, "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place,—whoso readeth let him understand—then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains." Matt. xxiv. 15, 16. He spoke of "the law of Moses "and the miracles which Moses wrought. The uplifted serpent in the wilderness was the type of the uplifting of the Son of man. The manna which their fathers did eat was the type of the bread of God which He gave that men might live forever. The deliverance of Jonah from the belly of hell he presented as the type of his own resurrection. He bade his hearers, "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of Me." He declared, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." Luke xvi. 31. He says, "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" John v. 46. He recognized the three divisions which comprised the Jewish Scriptures, and declared that the things written in the *Law of Moses*, and in the *Prophets*, and in *The Psalms*, "must be fulfilled." Luke xxiv. 44. He endorsed the scriptural account of the creation of man, "He which made them at the beginning, made them male and female." Matt. xix. 4–6. He accepted the Mosaic record of the first martyrdom, when he speaks of the "blood of righteous Abel." Matt. xxiii. 35. He endorsed the story of the deluge, and tells us that "as the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." Matt. xxiv. 37. He reminded his hearers of the overthrow of Sodom, and Gomorrah, exhorting them to "Remember Lot's wife." Luke xvii. 32. He declared, "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness." John vi. 49. He tells us that David "did eat the shewbread." 1 Sam. xxi.; Matt. xii. 3–4. He cites the miracle of the shutting of heaven for three years and six months, in answer to Elijah's prayers, the feeding of the hunted prophet by the widow of Sarepta, and the cleansing of Naaman the leper in Jordan, in accordance with Elisha's directions. Luke iv. 25–27. In the synagogue at Nazareth he read from the book of the Prophet Isaiah, and said, "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears."

Isa. lxi. 1; Luke iv. 18–22, and his quotations from Isaiah and Psalms are too numerous to be mentioned. He quotes from Malachi the last prophet, "Behold, I send my messenger before thy face" (Mal. iii. 1; Matt. xi. 10), and in the fulfillment of the predictions of the prophets he rested the proof of his own Messiahship.*

Once he met the great Enemy of righteousness in a hand to hand conflict, and resisted and defeated him. He used as a weapon the Sword of the Spirit. He introduced four passages of Scripture, saying of each of them, "It is written." In that day of fiercest battle he thrust his adversary through and through with this "sharp, two-edged sword." And where did he find those passages? *Every one of them was taken from the book of Deuteronomy.*† If the Tempter in the wilderness could have got a few points from modern Higher Critics, he might have ended the conflict by informing his opponent that Deuteronomy was a recent forgery by an unknown writer in the time of Josiah, or later; but he was not equal to the occasion, and so Christ was victorious, and Satan departed from him, and angels ministered unto him. Does this fact explain why unbelievers seem to have such a *special spite against the book of Deuteronomy?* Is this why so many pipe-smoking, beer-drinking critics when out of a job, are set at work on Deuteronomy? Well, thus far Deuteronomy seems to hold its own very well.

As a mere human teacher and Higher Critic, Jesus of Nazareth must be accounted far superior to all the critics of modern times both in abilities, opportunities, and facilities; and Jews and Gentiles, skeptics and critics, unite to describe him as a good, blameless and heroic man. Indeed one man declared that he "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." What then were

THE CLAIMS OF JESUS OF NAZARETH?

The claims of Jesus of Nazareth are not those of a mere human teacher. "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again I leave the world and go to the Father." John xvi. 28. "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?" John vi. 62. "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man." John iii. 13. "Glorify Thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was." John xvii. 5.

Such are some of the utterances which voice His claims; but no such claims could be admitted without there were credentials,

*For further particulars, consult the "*Testimony of Christ to the Truth of the Old Testament*," by Robert Patterson. ANTI-INFIDEL LIBRARY, No. 4.

†Luke iv. 1–13. Deut. viii. 3, vi. 13, x. 20, vi. 16.

tokens, and proofs of His divine legation. This fact was well understood among the Jewish people; and hence they were continually seeking for signs. As the ancient prophets showed by visible and manifest tokens that they possessed peculiar power and authority, so these people were disposed to say, "What sign showest Thou, that we may believe?" and the Saviour himself declares, "The same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me." John v. 36. "The works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me." John x. 25. "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very works' sake." John xiv. 11. And the Apostle John, after having related many things which the Saviour did, declares, "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that, believing, ye might have life through his name." John xx. 30–31. The Saviour himself says, "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin." John xv. 24; and the Apostle Peter, standing up in the presence of the multitude, said, "Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain: whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that He should be holden of it." Acts ii. 22–24.

This was a plain, definite assertion of wonderful works done by divine power; and this assertion, made in the presence of the multitude at Jerusalem, was not only uncontradicted, but after it was made not less than three thousand persons believed the story of the death and resurrection of Christ; and that not in some far off and unknown region, but in the very city where not two months before Jesus of Nazareth was scourged, and mocked, and spit upon, and buffeted, and crowned with thorns, and led away to be crucified.

Not only did Jesus of Nazareth do great and wonderful works, but he uttered wonderful words. There is nothing more transient and evanescent than a word. There are millions of people who have lived and talked from childhood to old age, and no single word that they have uttered is remembered. There are multitudes of people speaking to-day, and everything they say is forgotten within a few moments after it is uttered. But this man said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my *words* shall not pass away," and though he wrote no books, though none of his speeches

appeared in the public journals, yet by some means his words have lived, and live to the present day. They live in the records of his disciples; they live in the literature of the ages; they live in the hearts of the people; they live because the power of life is in them. What has given these words such wonderful vitality? Let us hear Him speak on this subject, "The words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself . . . The word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me." John xiv. 10, 24. Again he said, "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day. For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me so I speak." John xii. 48–50. Again in that last prayer offered before he went out to suffer he said, "I have given unto them the words which Thou gavest me, and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from Thee, and they have believed that Thou didst send me." John xvii. 8.

It is true that some men see nothing but an exalted humanity in these words. But what other man has ever had the audacity to use them? It is related that one man conversing with a much lauded pundit, a sage of the Brahminical caste of Newenglandstan, who could not see the pre-eminent dignity of the Son of man, asked him:

"Could you say, '*I am the resurrection and the life?*'"

"Yes," said he, "I could say that."

"But *could you make any one believe it?*" was the next question; and to that the answer was not forthcoming. But Jesus of Nazareth has said these words, and has *made men believe them!* and his words live to-day, and will live till heaven and earth shall pass away.

Now, many of the words which Jesus spoke, had reference to the writings of the ancient prophets. He himself read out of those Scriptures in the synagogue on the Sabbath day. He constantly referred to the Scriptures, and bade them search the Scriptures that they might know the truth. He said to his disciples, "O unwise, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken. . . . These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day." Luke xxiv. 25, 44–46. He frequently quotes from the Scriptures.

He said, "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of Me." John v. 46. When accused of making himself God, he answered, referring to Psalms lxxxii. 6, "Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken; say ye of Him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God? If I do not the works of My Father believe Me not, but if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in Me, and I in Him." John x. 34–38. Again he refers to another passage when proving the resurrection of the dead, "Have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?" Matt. xxii. 31, 32.

The argument seems very plain: Christ came claiming to be a messenger of God; he wrought signs and wonders and miracles; he ruled the winds, he calmed the waves; he controlled the fishes of the sea; he healed the sick, he raised the dead; he cast out devils; he was avowed to be the "well beloved Son" of God by a voice from heaven. He himself declared that he had "done the works which none other man ever did," and thousands who saw the works and knew the facts believed on Him. And then he distinctly claimed that his *words* that he spoke were given him of God, that they were a message from the eternal throne, and were to outlast the world, and to judge men at the last day; and that the Jewish Scriptures which he and they read were "The Word of God," the words of life and salvation. Are these things so?

We are to embrace the truth at whatever hazard, and are to follow it wherever it leads. But first we must know what *is* truth, and see whether that which is presented as truth is likely to lead us into a labyrinth of absurdities. Hence we have a right to examine a theory in all its bearings and consequences before accepting or rejecting it.

An arc of a great circle may seem like a *straight line.* We may need to carry it around in its sweep to convince ourselves that *every inch of it is crooked.* Two lines may seem exactly parallel, but if we project them a million of miles they may show a vast divergence. So theories must be tested not only by the experiences of time but by the revelations of eternity. That which is not eternally true may not be true at all; and if a theory leads us away from Him who is the Truth, we may well hesitate before we embrace it.

Let us see what are the results of some of this critical teaching, as stated by Rev. Philip H. Wicksteed, in an article on Abraham Kuenen whose disciple and translator he was:

"The position which Kuenen took . . . involved the *absolute surrender* of orthodox dogmatics, of *the authority of the Scriptures*, of the divine character of the church as an external institution; and of course it based the claims of Jesus of Nazareth to our affection and gratitude solely upon what history could show that he, *as a man, had been* and *had done* for men."—*Jewish Quarterly Review*, July, 1892, p. 596.

This witness is true, and has the courage of his convictions. He is logical, and follows his logic, until we have no prophecy, no miracles, no Bible, no Saviour.

A theory is responsible for its consequences. Those who embrace it may not be responsible. They may be faulty in logic and inconsistent in act. They may not look to the final results of their theorizing. They may be led blindly into the marshes and quagmires of error and unbelief. We must not be so led. We must walk in the light, and understand the direction and the end of the path into which we enter.

Of course facts will stand, whatever they may be. But we must know that we *have* the facts. There are *false facts* as well as *false arguments;* false premises as well as false conclusions; errors at the root as well as errors in the branches; defects in foundations as well as in superstructures; and we are to examine everything, test everything, and investigate everything; we are to "prove all things and hold fast that which is good."

A settled principle with some of these Higher Critics,—if any of their principles can be said to be settled,—is, that inspired prophecy is an impossibility, that all claims to it are mere rhapsody, or fraud and trickery; and that the authors of the prophetical writings, as well as the writers of the Pentateuch, were simply patriotic liars and romancing forgers, who strove to fire the hearts of their countrymen by spurious predictions, falsely attributed to men who never predicted such events, nor indeed any other events,—an instance apparently of issuing counterfeit notes on a bank whose genuine bills were worthless.

Of course if it be settled that prophecy is impossible, that ends all controversy regarding its inspiration, and it also ends all faith in the writings of those apostles who reasoned out of the Scriptures, saying none other things than those which Moses and the prophets did say should come (Acts xxvi. 22), and proves that the Jews were perfectly justified in rejecting a Saviour, who had never been predicted, and whose coming was not a fulfillment of any recorded promise or purpose of the God of Abraham.

Great differences of opinion exist regarding the estimate which

should be placed upon those writings known as the Holy Scriptures. There are those who believe that they are able to make men "wise unto salvation through faith that is in Christ Jesus" and that by them "the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works:" there are others who assert that "'The Bible as we now have it, swarms with errors;" and they naturally would give but a guarded and qualified endorsement to such a volume.

FETISHISM AND BIBLIOLATRY.

According to some of the wise and prudent Critics of the day, there is great danger that the Bible will be regarded as a sort of fetish, like those which are worshiped by the lowest idolaters, who tie bags of rags, snake skins, dried toads and other trumpery about them, and make them objects of adoration. And there seems to be a fear that the civilization and intellectual advancement of the age will be imperiled by people who look on the Holy Scriptures with superstitious regard as a fetish: and consequently when critics who have been emancipated from this form of fetish worship by finding out that the Bible is nothing but an ordinary book, full of errors, blunders, misstatements, fictions, falsehoods, and forgeries, they at once become enamored of its beauty, and prize it far more highly than they ever did when they regarded it as a fetish.

There are some things which are peculiar to this special form of fetish worship. As an invariable rule other fetishes are only found among the most ignorant, degraded, barbarous, and brutal races on the face of the earth, who worship fetishes, capture slaves, eat human flesh, live by predatory warfare, practice every kind of barbarism and impurity, and find nothing in fetish worship inconsistent with these practices and barbarities. This particular fetish, however, seems to be most prized and regarded among the most intellectual, prosperous, humane, and progressive races on the face of the earth. Wherever you find the common school and universal education you find this fetish. Wherever you find a place of worship, where instead of noise, ceremony, and dumb-show, the services appeal to intelligence, intellect, and chastened emotion, there you find this fetish. Wherever you find the bonds of the slave broken, and liberty proclaimed to the captive, you find this fetish. Wherever you find colleges and universities teaching art, science, literature, and pure morality, you find this fetish at the bottom of it all. Wherever you find female schools, academies, and seminaries, there you find this fetish in the place of honor. Wherever you find one of near a hundred languages and dialects which had only existed for ages in speech and memory, at last reduced to writing,

grammatically analyzed, and the foundations laid for its literature, you find that the work has been done by a votary of this particular fetish; and the chief corner stone of the new literature which blesses these bookless multitudes, is this same fetish, from which they read in their own tongues wherein they were born, the story of the wonderful works of God. Wherever we find advancement and invention we find this fetish leading the way. If we travel by steamer or by railway it is only in lands where this fetish has influence. If we use mowing machines, and reaping machines, and threshing machines, and sewing machines, we find them only among the people who are interested in this fetish. If we use the printing-press, the telegraph, or the telephone; if we grind our corn in the most approved manner; if we produce our clothes, and boots, and shoes, by spinning machines, power looms, stitching machines, and all the host of labor saving devices of the present day; these without exception come from men who have been brought up under the influence of this fetish, and who have been taught to regard it of the utmost value. Wherever we find hospitals for the sick, asylums for the insane, orphanages for the fatherless, schools for the blind, soup kitchens for the poor, and homes for the homeless, we will find this same fetish at the bottom of the whole. Wherever we find a cannibal turned to a peaceable Christian there we find this fetish. Wherever we find a Mohawk or a Modoc putting off his war paint and putting on the habiliments of civilization, we find this fetish. Wherever we find a savage tribe civilized, humanized, and educated we find this fetish. Wherever we find womanhood honored, infancy protected, family life held sacred, property secure, and liberty regarded, we find this fetish. The worshipers of this fetish all read and write: the worshipers of other fetishes cannot. The only nation that has lived through thirty centuries of conflict, storm, and trouble, is a nation which has crystalized around this fetish, which has maintained its existence in spite of invasion, captivity, dispersion, and affliction, while all the nations and governments of its time have rotted down through their vices and their sins: and to-day, in the United States of America the representatives of that ancient nation of fetish worshipers have a death-rate only half as heavy as that of the nation at large, with all its culture, its criticism, its skepticism, and its contempt for the Word of God. Wherever we find other fetishes we find idolatry, savagery, cruelty, debauchery, and all abominations as deep and as dark in the closing years of the nineteenth century as they ever were in the darkest ages of antiquity. It is only among the worshipers of this particular fetish that progress, advancement, and civilization may be

discerned. Surely such a fetish as this is not likely to do a vast amount of harm,—especially as it is found that most of the criminals and evil men who disgrace and distress our land are men who have had little to do with *this* fetish, and have been brought up outside of its influence.

Doubtless fetish worship in general is to be deplored and discountenanced; but there are fetishes *and* fetishes, and if the men who are opposing this particular type of fetishism would devote their attention to uprooting *other forms* of fetish worship, which are widely prevalent in other lands, they might meet a more urgent need, and have greater prospects of success. For while hundreds of other fetishes have been abandoned and cast aside by the savages which adored them, we do not recall a single nation where this fetish had established itself, which has ever given it up.

One thing to be noted is that while other fetishes are manufactured by old women, medicine-men, and magicians, in dim corners, and in dark ages and dark places of the earth, the manufacture of this particular fetish has flourished most in the centers of education, intelligence, and civilization; and since the year 1804 a single Society organized in London, the commercial and literary metropolis of the world, has produced 135 millions of these fetishes, in 307 languages, 262 of which have been translated between 1803, and 1893; more than four millions (4,049,756), of them having been sent forth during the year 1892–3. And though there have been more books written against this fetish, more laws made prohibiting it, more men persecuted and slain for having it than any other fetish that the world has ever known, yet there are to-day ten times as many of these fetishes in existence as there are of any other fetish known to man. Indeed this fetish has made such progress, gathered so many adherents, and acquired such endowments and evidences of material prosperity, that some of the men who seem least inclined to respect its merits are yet quite willing to tacitly accept the fetish and the emoluments that attend it; very few of them having been known to resign comfortable positions in order to free themselves from all complicity with it. Indeed we can hardly recollect one of the opposers of this fetish who has ever run the risk of being stoned, sawn asunder, beaten with rods, or of receiving "forty stripes save one," because of his opposition to this fetish worship. Other fetishes seem to be easily uprooted—this maintains its hold. Other fetishes are dead trash; but "*the Word of God is living and powerful, and sharper than a two-edged sword.*" Can it be that the reason why the worship of this fetish dies so hard is because it is "THE WORD OF GOD THAT LIVETH AND ABIDETH FOREVER?"

THE PENTATEUCH,
ITS ORIGIN AND AUTHORSHIP.

THE PENTATEUCH:

ITS

ORIGIN AND AUTHORSHIP.

BY H. L. HASTINGS.

Some of the Critics of the present day have a quiet way of assuming as facts things which they do not undertake to demonstrate, and taking for granted what they cannot prove. For thousands of years the "*Five Books*" of the Jewish Law, called the *Pentateuch*, have been attributed to Moses, the Hebrew Lawgiver. Josephus states in his treatise *Against Apion*, (i. 8,) they had "twenty-two books, which contain the records of all the past times, which are justly believed to be divine. And of them, *five belong to Moses*, which contain his laws, and the traditions of the origin of mankind till his death." The names of these five books are of Greek origin, and perhaps due to the translators of the Septuagint. They are separate divisions of one great work. The rabbinical writers call these books "the five-fifths of the law."

But Modern Critics, instead of discussing the question of the origin of the Pentateuch, have taken to discussing the origin of the "Hexateuch," the *six books*, thus including Joshua; and proceeding to argue for the late origin of all these books. Of course if they can add a number of books which no one ever supposed Moses wrote, and which make no claim to a Mosaic origin; and then can jumble and churn them all together as if they were of uncertain date, it helps them greatly in their effort to show that the Pentateuch is a late forgery by unknown Jewish writers; and so the whole matter is assumed so quietly, that before persons are aware of the fact, the ground is shifted, and half the argument is claimed as if it were conceded.

We do not assent to this re-arrangement. We are not discussing a "Hexateuch,"—of which no one ever heard till the Higher

Critics invented it—but the *Pentateuch*, the *Five Books* of Moses, which have been known for thousands of years as "the Book of the Law," which was to be put "in the side of the Ark of the Covenant," Deut. xxxi. 26; "the book of the law of the Lord;" the code by which the Jewish nation was governed. "The law which Moses my servant commanded thee." Josh. i. 7. "The Book of the law of Moses which he wrote in the presence of the children of Israel." Josh. viii. 31–35. "The commandment and the law, which Moses the servant of the LORD charged you." Josh. xxii. 5. "The statutes and judgments which the Lord charged Moses with concerning Israel." 1 Chron. xxii. 13. "The book of the law in the house of the Lord." 2 Ki. xxii. 8. "The law of Moses the man of God." 2 Chron. xxx. 16. "The statutes, and the ordinances, and the law, and the commandment which God wrote for you." 2 Ki. xvii. 34–37. "The law of Moses which the Lord God of Israel had given." Ezra vii. 6. "The book of the law of Moses which the Lord had commanded to Israel." Neh. viii. 1. "The law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments." Mal. iv. 4.

The Law of Moses and these Five Books of Moses were entirely separate from the succeeding books, from Joshua to Malachi. They furnished the basis for the commonwealth of Israel; they were the organic law of the nation. Later books contain history, genealogy, prophecy, theology, and ethical and practical instruction, but none of them are legislative or organic. The Jewish nation had no legislature; their laws were not enacted one year and repealed the next. Given at first in the wilderness, modified as they stood on the borders of Canaan, they henceforth remained the sacred heritage of the chosen people, who, clustering around them, have maintained their existence under most adverse circumstances till the present time. And the Mosaic authorship of the Jewish law has been expressly affirmed, not only by the Jews, and Samaritans, and Christians, but by numerous heathen authors, such as Hecatæus, Manetho, Lysimachus, Tacitus, Strabo, Juvenal, Longinus,* etc.

The man who had twenty reasons to offer for the non-appearance of his friend in court, was doubtless possessed of much logical power and acumen; but having stated as his first reason, that *the man was dead*, the court considerately waived the hearing of the other nineteen, and dismissed the subject. There are doubtless skeptical critics who could give us twenty reasons why the law of Moses should not be received as of divine authority and inspiration, but they lay their axe at the root of the tree when they state at

*For References and proofs, see *Remarks on the Mistakes of Moses*, pp. 4–7.

the outset that Moses *did not write the law*, and had little or nothing to do with it. This fact if once established, carries everything else with it, and stamps the whole as a fraud and a forgery.

It is a wearisome task to assail the Bible in detail, and to deny and contradict its declarations one by one; but the matter is greatly simplified if we can treat the books themselves as suppositious, legendary, and 'unhistorical.' Thus men save the trouble of discussing separate points and particulars, and throw the book overboard at once: for a man who would prove that the various books comprised in the Hebrew Scriptures were forgeries and fictions, and then attempt to cultivate reverence for these exploded legends, and found a religious worship upon them, might be expected to construct a school geography upon the basis of Gulliver's Travels, or found a system of religion upon the teachings of the Arabian Nights.

The question of the origin and authorship of the Pentateuch, or the "*Five Books*" of Moses, therefore becomes a primary question, to be considered before we greatly trouble ourselves concerning the character and contents of the books themselves. It is consistent thus to lay the axe at the root of the tree. If the work is a fraud, an invention, and an imposition, we need not discuss its contents or its character; if, however, it is found to be a genuine work, written at the time it purports to be, and substantially by the man to whom it is attributed, it will then be in order to examine its contents and discuss its merits.

In reading a book there is a natural interest to know its author. If it bears upon its title page a well-known name, we usually accept this testimony as conclusive evidence of its authorship. If, however, we learn that some one else *claims* to have written the book, we then enter upon an investigation to ascertain who is the rightful claimant. If a book is openly known and publicly read from the time of its origin, its authorship can hardly be a matter of dispute. There was a time when the book was unknown, and did not exist; when it came to be known there were persons who knew its authorship, and unless they were interested to conceal it, the facts could be easily ascertained. If a book purported to be recently discovered, after having been hidden and unknown for ages, of course the question of its authorship would be more complicated; but if a book had been written and published, and was generally read, and known, and accepted as the production of a certain author; and if no other person ever claimed the authorship thereof; then unless there were very cogent reasons for doubting the veracity of the claimant, we should regard the authorship of the volume as settled.

It is not easy to impose a spurious book upon any nation or

community, especially a book of laws, rules, and regulations, or even a book of histories dealing with matters known to them or to their fathers. A spurious book is liable to be criticised, and its defects are quite sure to be discerned. Literary deceptions do not usually long remain undetected. If a man succeeds in perpetrating a liter ary fraud, some sharp-witted investigator will pierce the disguise and expose the cheat; or possibly the author himself, through remorse, or from vanity, will voluntarily declare what he has done, and take to himself the honor or the blame due for his production.

A few years since there went the rounds of the papers a crude rhyme which purported to be the prophecy of a certain "Mother Shipton," who lived about 1448, and who in it foretold steam locomotion, the invention of balloons, revolutions in France, the career of D'Israeli, the erection of the Crystal Palace, etc. It had a considerable currency, and was sometimes cited by skeptics as a modern instance of prophetic foresight. It reappeared from time to time with certain slight additions, the work apparently of some "redacteur" or editor, containing additional predictions corresponding to new developments of current events. At length the authorship of the prophecy was traced to one Charles Hindly, who wrote the Mother Shipton prophecy in 1862, and set it adrift to take its chances among the critics.

Toward the close of the last century a Tory Parson, Samuel A. Peters, concocted and published that farrago of nonsense and absurdity known as the "Blue Laws" of Connecticut; and there are probably on earth to-day a few benighted skeptics and editors of Sunday papers, who really believe that the legislature of the New Haven Colony, Connecticut, did enact laws "that no husband should kiss his wife, and no mother her children on Sunday or on Fast Day; that a beer barrel should be whipped if the beer in it worked on Sunday; that on that day no one should cook food, make beds, sweep house, cut hair, or shave himself; and that every male in the colony should have his hair cut round by a cap, or, if a cap was wanting, then by the scooped-out shell of a half-pumpkin!" And hence, when legislators and philanthropists, seeking to protect both man and beast from the exactions of tyranny and greed, by the enactment of laws securing to weary toilers that weekly day of rest which is demanded by physical law and is essential to the physical and moral well-being of mankind·* these fomenters of irreligion, anarchy and disorder—who seem to

*For facts concerning the importance of the weekly rest day, consult "*The Wonderful Law*," "*Remarks on the Mistakes of Moses*," "*Dividends*," etc., by H. L. Hastings.

regard a man as only a cog-wheel in a great money-making machine, to be run till it breaks, and then flung away and replaced by another—set up their periodic wail about the abridgment of personal liberty by "Connecticut Blue Laws," and "Puritanic legislation."

But though an intelligent believer in the "Connecticut Blue Laws" fiction, might fitly claim a place as a fossil in a dime museum, yet there are other specimens which seem equally worthy of preservation.* And the man who can *now* believe that a few centuries hence the Blue Laws of Connecticut will be *adopted* and *enforced* as *authoritative* in that ancient commonwealth; and that the prophecies of Mother Shipton will also be received as a divine revelation; and that both together will be read in all the synagogues of Connecticut every sabbath day, would be justly entitled to a preservation as an unnatural curiosity, beside a stuffed specimen of Parson Peters' wonderful "Whapperknocker."

Such a man would probably be credulous enough to believe that within the space of a very few hundred years, the laws, prophecies, and sacred writings of the Old Testament could have been forged, imposed upon the people, accepted by them, placed among their sacred records, and handed down through successive generations as holy writings inspired by the Spirit of the living God. And the men who are able to believe that so many different writers, capable of producing laws like those of Moses, prophecies like those of Isaiah, poetry like that of Job, and psalms like those of David; who in their life-time were scattered over a tract of hundreds of years; would all, in an excess of modesty, conceal their names, deny the authorship of their own writings, and attribute them to certain men long dead, who had written nothing, said nothing, and done nothing which should make them specially famous,—the men who could believe all this, and could believe that

*"The true origin of these 'Blue Laws'" says the *N. Y. Observer*, "is that they were written by the Rev. Samuel A. Peters, a renegade Tory, who was driven from the colony, and who, in anger and spite published these laws in 1781. According to the historian Trumbull he was known as the greatest falsifier in the colony, telling such incredibly absurd stories as that of the 'Windham Frogs,' and of those unearthly and fearful quadrupeds, the 'Cuba,' and the 'Whapperknocker;' and that the Rev. Thomas Hooker of Hartford spread the poison of small-pox on the leaves of Bibles which he sent to the Indians, and so swept away the great sachem Connecticote—an imaginary person—and his warriors, and so laid waste their kingdom; and, climax of all, that in the Connecticut river at Bellows Falls, Vt., 'the water is consolidated without frost, by pressure, as it swiftly passes between the binding, sturdy rocks, to such a degree of *induration* that *no iron bar can be forced into it;* here iron, lead, and cork have one common weight; here steady as time and *harder than marble*, the stream passes as irresistibly, if not as swiftly as lightning.'"

such laws and prophecies, so produced and sent forth, would remain for centuries with their authorship unknown, and the imposition undetected, until they were accepted and enforced as genuine, authoritative, and divinely inspired; would seem to be endowed with many of the qualities which enter into the composition of the Higher Critic of the present day, to qualify him to sit in judgment upon "the oracles of God."

CHANGES IN STYLE AND LANGUAGE.

It is held by some critics that the Pentateuch could not have been written by Moses, because it agrees in style with the later Jewish writings; for it is held that the Hebrew language must have been greatly modified through the centuries of their national existence. But in answer to this it is said, that the later books of the minor prophets *do* differ in style from the Pentateuch, as well as from the earlier prophetical writings, by reason of the introduction of the Chaldee element, during the seventy years captivity in Babylon. But as regards changes in the ancient Hebrew tongue, the question arises, What chance was there for change? This language was the legal, social and ecclesiastical language of the nation, used in daily life, in law, and in worship. The literature of such a nation could not have been extensive. The Mosaic law was to be read to the people publicly once in seven years, and as the people were homogeneous, having one common organization, and as their males were required to assemble three times a year in Jerusalem, and as the Israelites were commanded to meditate in this law, and diligently teach it to their children, it is not easy to see how their language could be corrupted or broken up into tribal dialects. They were not a company of petty nationalities and principalities; they were one nation, children of one father, bound by one law, and ruled from one center. They were not a commercial people, and had little communication with outside nations: they were separated from other races by their faith, their customs, their religion, and their government, all of which were prescribed and fixed by the Mosaic law. They were taught to abhor and avoid the surrounding idolatries; and the literature of other nations, so far as they had any literature, can have had very little effect upon the Israelites. Carried captive to Babylon, of course they learned the language of their conquerors; but till the Babylonish captivity their language was substantially unchanged.

We are not to draw a parallel between things which essentially differ. The changes in the English language, springing from such diverse sources—Aryan, Roman, Scandinavian, Teutonic, and

Norman; broken up by internecine convulsions and external invasions, by changes in government and religion, by the spread of literature, by the discovery of printing, and the wide acquaintance thus gained with the languages and writings of other nations; can afford no criteria for estimating the modifications in the laws and language of a quiet, isolated, homogeneous, secluded people like the Israelites during the lapse of passing centuries.

The testimony of competent scholars leads to the conclusion that nations do not change their languages so readily as some imagine. Other influences besides the mere lapse of years must contribute to such changes, as can be shown by many illustrative examples. Between the times of Plautus, (B. C. 254–184), and Gregory the Great, (A. D. 550–604), stretched a period of seven or eight hundred years, during which the Latin was a living and ever changing tongue. During that period wars had convulsed the nations, revolutions had rocked the world, Christianity had appeared, Rome had reached the acme of her glory, and had gone far down in decay, and yet these two writers used the same language. New words are introduced, old words become obsolete, but the language as a whole was the same.

So down to the year A. D. 530, the Greek was a current language with the people, and it was as nearly identical with the Greek of seven or eight hundred years before, as the Hebrew of the Jews when they went into captivity was with that of the Pentateuch. Specimens of Egyptian papyrus of widely different eras show that, though separated by an interval of a thousand years, they are of the same stamp and general character, and their grammar has not undergone the slightest change; and the language of Asiatic nations, like their customs and usages, still shares a similar permanence, notwithstanding the flight of time.

Arguments of this kind of course depend upon the judgment of experts; but it is not altogether certain that expert testimony is absolutely unimpeachable, or that expert judgment is entirely infallible. We have not yet had the verdict of half a dozen experts *writing independently of each other*, and in utter ignorance of each other's views and conclusions; and the consensus of a number of critics *after comparison and consultation*, may not be absolutely convincing to the average student, who makes no claims to expert critical ability, but who still is not disposed to yield to the unsupported assertion of one or two collusive critical authorities. Indeed if these scholars would win our unquestioning confidence, it behooves them to test their critical abilities in some manner which shall be tangible, and within the reach of the ordinary student.

Dr. Franklin Johnson in an article in *The Watchman*, has proposed the following very sensible method of

TESTING THE HIGHER CRITICS ON SHAKESPEARE:

"Some of the statements of the Newer Criticism are so incredible in themselves that they should be supported by mighty evidences before we give them credence. We are asked to believe, for example, that the critic, working in an ancient and dead language, cannot only determine that a given book was written by four or five different authors, but can assign his part accurately to each one of them, running the dividing line at times through the middle of a sentence, thus 'distinguishing a hair 'twixt north and north-west sides.' This claim of the critics is so astounding that we may well demand the most cogent proofs before admitting it. We are told that it is a question which can be settled only by experts, and that since all the experts agree, we should believe on their testimony. But *the experts themselves need to be tested* before we can believe in their ability to do this thing. *The test is easily applied*, and if their claims are just, may be easily met. Let the critics do in their *own language* what they profess to have done in a foreign and dead language. There are the mixed plays of Shakespeare, partly his work, and partly the work of his associates. Let the critics solve this problem before they demand too much of our faith. Indeed they have tried to solve it, and have failed, as they themselves confess. Coleridge was, perhaps, the last of the students of Shakespeare to believe that he could separate the work of the great poet from the rest; and Macaulay pronounces his pretentions pure nonsense. The failure of the critics in this case is the more instructive for us since the style of Skakespeare is so peculiar, so different from that of every other writer, so entirely his own. Let the critics of art tell us what part of the frescos of the Vatican were painted by Raphael, and what part by his pupils. Until these lighter tasks have been accomplished by the experts, we may be slow to believe that they have accomplished the heavier."

If half a dozen of these Higher Critics could be separated and secluded, and set at work sorting out Shakespeare; and then if the results of their studies could be printed without comparison or collusion; we might by comparing their work judge of their infallibility as critics, and the exactness of the science of Higher Criticism; and we might then be ready to have them undertake to reconstruct the Bible in the same manner and under the same conditions and restrictions. Are they ready for such a test? How would they endure it?

The editor of *The Watchman* vouches for the following instance illustrating the uncertainty of this style of criticism: "A certain editor was interrogated by Prof. A., an eminent critic, as to the authorship of an article, and as soon as the question was asked, he said: 'Of course you do not care to say, but I know that B. wrote it; it is full of his peculiarities of style.' A few days later the editor fell in with Dr. B., the man to whom Prof. A. had referred. 'By the way,' he said,'that was a pretty good article that you had the other day,'—mentioning the one of which Prof. A. had spoken. 'I know it was written by Prof. A. It is just like him.'"

Such instances might be multiplied. It is not easy for persons to pronounce with infallible correctness concerning the style of persons who live in their own time, and write in their own tongue, and with whom they have personal acquaintance. What dependence then can we place upon their critical judgment concerning the authorship of documents thousands of years old, written in foreign tongues, and under unknown circumstances, and so brief that they afford but very limited data for the exercise of critical judgment concerning their origin.

THE GERMAN CRITICS TESTED.

In the year 1843 there issued from the German press a volume entitled *Die Bernstein Hexe*, or "The Amber Witch," which was edited and had an introduction by Pastor Johann Wilhelm Meinhold, of the Island of Rugen in the Baltic, who related that some time after he was appointed to his cure in the Island, in a chest in his sacristy he found a number of old documents; parish registers, bills, records of marriages, deaths, and other parish matters; and among them a Roll, written in *Old German*, in a style now disused, which proved to be a narrative, by one of his predecessors, of the trial of a woman for witchcraft, in the Island of Rugen. This manuscript he deciphered, and thus introduced to the world. It caused a great sensation. It gave much information concerning the period after the death of Luther and his associates, and learned critics indulged in many conjectures regarding its authorship. The German reviews took it up, and discussed it for about twelve months, and were as delighted with the light it cast upon an obscure period, as they were with the critical evidence produced by Strauss that the gospel story was a myth, and the history of Christ a series of cunningly devised fables.

At length Meinhold wrote thus to the reviews and newspapers: "Reliable critics you are of the Greek of the New Testament Books! The book you have been reading and praising is the

production of my own brain in my own study in the last five years. You were not able to discover the deception and detect the forgery *in your own language.* You may be dismissed as critics of the Books of the New Testament."

The critics were enraged, and assailed him as a lying impostor. But he was the author of "The Amber Witch," and proved that he was; and criticism had another illustration of the infallibility of the learned critics, who expect the common people to accept their assertions as the end of both law and gospel; and who are as confident of their ability to assign dates to manuscripts of whose origin they can have no positive knowledge, as the Cape Cod skipper was of his ability to tell his location in a fog, by smelling of the sounding lead as he hauled it up from the bottom of the sea.

TIME NOTES AND FOOT NOTES.

Undoubtedly there are certain notes of events contained in the different books of the Bible which indicate the time in which the author wrote. Thus we are told in Joshua xv. 63, "The Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah at Jerusalem *unto this day.*" Then we read in 2 Samuel, v. 6–9, that David took the stronghold of Zion, notwithstanding the resistance of the Jebusites. This shows that the book of Joshua was written before the time of David's conquest of Jerusalem. So in Joshua xvi. 10 it is written of the Israelites, "they drave not out the Canaanites that dwelt in Gezer, but the Canaanites dwell among the Ephraimites *unto this day,* and serve under tribute." But we read in 1 Kings ix. 16, "Pharaoh king of Egypt had gone up and taken Gezer, and burnt it with fire, and slain the Canaanites that dwelt in the city, and given it for a present unto his daughter, Solomon's wife. And Solomon built Gezer." This was in the time of Solomon, about a thousand years before the birth of the Saviour, and the book of Joshua must have been written before that time. But there are doubtless other instances where suggestive or explanatory expressions occur, which are the marginal notes or comments of later writers, students or transcribers.

Nothing is more common than the appending of necessary supplementary notes to important books and documents. The works of most great writers have been issued with annotations by various authors. The productions of Shakespeare, Milton, Gibbon, Homer, Herodotus, Plato, and most of the ancient philosophers, historians, and poets, have been published with comments and explanations, needful for the elucidation of obscure passages, the explanation of obsolete words, and the information of readers unfamiliar with the subject of the writings or the circumstances under which they

were written. Such notes, comments, and explanations, are sometimes bracketed in the text, but are more usually placed in the margin, or at the bottom of the page, and are distinguished from the text by certain marks of reference, and by being printed in smaller type.

There are also books in almost every library, which have, in addition to such appended annotations, manuscript notes, inserted by thoughtful and attentive readers, making needful explanations, alluding to related facts, or giving references to other sources of information. It is the constant practice of many persons to thus annotate the books in their libraries, and so prone are readers to do this, that in public libraries stringent rules are necessary to prevent readers writing on the margins of books which do not belong to them. All such annotations being in manuscript, show for themselves that they were appended after the volumes were published.

No books have ever been so largely annotated and commented upon as the different books of the Bible. Multitudes of ponderous tomes of these annotations have been written and published. Every translation of the Bible, or any part of it, includes more or less of paraphrase, annotation, and explanation. We have in our times scores of Commentaries on the Holy Scriptures. When we go back to past ages, we find volumes and volumes of annotations and comments in the early Christian church. Going still further back, we find the Jewish Talmuds and Targums, and the Chaldee Paraphrases, which were greatly esteemed and served very important purposes among the Jews.

Now it would be natural to suppose that at still earlier dates, notes and explanations might have been added to the text of Scripture by any one who chanced to be the possessor of a manuscript copy, and who might wish to define a locality the name of which had been changed, explain something which would otherwise be obscure to the uninformed, or place on record some connected fact which ought not to be forgotten. And as books were few, and writing materials were not always accessible, unless such memoranda were written then and there, they might never be recorded. We must bear in mind that these books of the Bible which would thus naturally be annotated were not printed; so there were no different kinds of type in use to distinguish notes from text. There was no proof-reading, or careful editing, as is now the case when such books are issued, and any comments written upon the manuscript might be in the same hand-writing as the body of the book. What then would be more natural than that a future

transcriber, who might not be intellectually acute or critical, and might have no knowledge of the special facts in the case, and no other copy of the manuscript roll for comparison, should fail to notice that certain sentences were comments and additions, and should copy them into his manuscript as if they were a part of the original work.

Such considerations as these, it is believed, very reasonably explain some of the few passages which are quoted as indicating a non-Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch,—an explanatory phrase or sentence being added here or there by some thoughtful reader, and embodied in the text by some subsequent transcriber, and thus being transmitted to later ages as a portion of the original text.

But if, in consideration of these difficulties, we are led to admit the non-Mosaic and recent origin of these books, we are speedily confronted with ten-fold greater difficulties than those we escape by such admission.

The Pentateuch has not been hidden in a corner and recently discovered. It was not transmitted by oral tradition for hundreds of years before being written down, like the sacred books of the East. It does not claim to have been revealed in a single night like the Korán, nor dug out of a hole in the ground like the book of Mormon; but it is a book which has been publicly known and read in an open and above-board manner for thousands of years. It has been brought down to us in the guardian care of three distinct and antagonistic classes of people, the Jews, the Samaritans, and the Christians. There has not been a week for thousands of years when it has not been publicly read in various places, and in the ears of multitudes of people; and through all these ages *no person has ever laid claim to the honor of its authorship*, for himself or anyone else. Such presumptive evidence of the genuineness of the Pentateuch should be met by distinct and authentic traditions, and ancient historical records, showing who really did write the books, if they were not the work of "Moses, the man of God."

It may not be needful to assert that every line of these five books was personally written by Moses' own hand. He may have embodied quotations from pre-existing writers, and genealogical records, which had been carefully preserved and handed down by previous generations. The books may have been partly written by an amanuensis from dictation, or by a secretary or recorder, who kept the journal of the days' doings as they came; and yet such books, written by the authority, and under the dictation of Moses, may have been really his books, for whose contents he was entirely responsible.

Often internal evidence determines questions concerning the authorship of a work. A book full of grammatical blunders would not be regarded as the work of a finished scholar, even if it bore his name. In the autumn of 1880, a letter purporting to have been written by a candidate for the presidency of the United States; which, for political purposes, was scattered in fac-simile through the length and breadth of the land on the very eve of the election, by some of those politicians who are especially frugal in their use of truth on such occasions; was found to contain certain words so *mis-spelled* as to indicate clearly that it could *not* have been from the pen of a literary gentleman like General Garfield, whose name had been villainously appended to it; but must have been rather the production of some politician or office-seeker, who evidently had neglected to study his spelling-book, as well as to learn the Ten Commandments.

A book full of the abstrusest learning would not be easily accepted as the production of an ignorant boor or clown. A comprehensive treatise on common law would not be expected from a police court shyster, or a country Dogberry; and a treatise on hygiene, furnishing the best code of health possessed by any nation, and reducing the death-rate of those who observed it to one-half the death-rate of the people around them, could not be supposed to heve emanated from the mind of a rude, uncultured barbarian. But there is nothing in the character of the five books of Moses which is inconsistent with the claim that they were written by a man learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, brought up in the court of the Pharaohs, skilled in the conduct of civil and military affairs, and trained and fully experienced as a commander and judge, in the management of a great people. Who else can be named in the history of the Hebrew people so capable of producing such a code and such a record, as he of whom it is said, "There arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses whom the Lord knew face to face?"

It is claimed that there are differences in style in the different books ascribed to Moses, and that he could not have been the author of those books. But there are differences of style in different works on various subjects, produced by any man of flexible intellect, and wide and varied culture. A mechanical, narrow-minded, and comparatively ignorant man, possessed of few ideas and limited vocabulary, can only write in one style; but a man acquainted with law, medicine, history, politics, poetry, archæology, ethnology, and geography, as he treats upon these various subjects, deals with them in varied styles of diction.

Besides it is more than possible that in preparing the book of Genesis, Moses examined and made use of documents, records, and traditions, that were written, preserved, and handed down by patriarchs and prophets who preceded him, and some of these may have been incorporated in his writings without essential change of diction.

When we remember that eleven chapters in Genesis bring us down from the creation unto the calling of Abraham, it will easily be seen that the recollection and preservation of such a brief record was a slight task, compared with the transmission of the 15,677 lines of the Iliad which was handed down for generations and perhaps for centuries before it was ever written; or 1,017 hymns of the Rig Veda, a work about four times as large as the Iliad, which was not only memorized, but has been brought down by word of mouth, independent of books and manuscripts, for thousands of years, by a class of priests in India, who are required to know the whole of it by heart.

We must remember that though the time from the creation to the flood, a period of about 1656 years, would cover nearly fifty generations at the present time; yet of this period Adam lived more than half, or 930 years. At Adam's death Methuselah was 233 years old, and he lived till 1655,—the year before the flood. Thus two lives covered the antediluvian period; and Noah and his house connect the old world that was destroyed with the new world that succeeded it.

As Adam lived 930 years, and Noah was 600 years old at the time of the deluge, there were only 126 years between the death of Adam and the birth of Noah. But Noah's father was 182 years old at Noah's birth, and he, having been cotemporary with Adam fifty-six years, lived with Noah 595 years, dying five years before the flood. Therefore Noah during 595 years, had the opportunity of learning all that was known by his own father, who had lived fifty-six years the cotemporary of Adam, and was besides, cotemporary with Enos, Cainan, Jared, Enoch, and Methuselah. Shem, Noah's son, was ninety-eight years old at the time of the flood, and was thus for ninety-three years cotemporary with Lamech, his grandfather, who was fifty-six years old at the death of Adam. Living 500 years after the flood, Shem was for 150 years the cotemporary of Abraham: hence between Adam and Abraham were *only three witnesses*, Lamech, Noah, and Shem; Abraham being removed by only *four lives* from the creation of the first man.

Abraham lived 175 years; and Jacob was fifteen years old when Abraham died, and lived 147 years. At his death Joseph was fifty six years old, and Joseph lived to the age of 110, in the midst

of the splendors of Egyptian civilization, with literature, records, and inscriptions which may be seen to-day upon the walls and pillars of Egyptian temples, palaces, and tombs.

The writer has trustworthy *unwritten* traditions of *words* spoken and *acts done* by his father, grandfather, great grandfather, and great, great grandfather; besides written records of preceding generations, and these traditions have come down casually, charged with no important message, but bearing every evidence of truthfulness. Now through the long reaches of antediluvian and patriarchal ages it would require but *six lives* to cover the space from the creation of man to the establishment of the Israelitish nation in the midst of Egyptian civilization and literature. Hence there was nothing difficult in the transmission of uncorrupted traditions and authentic records, from the time of the creation of Adam down to the days of Moses and the giving of the Law.

It is sometimes objected that the recorded longevity of the patriarchs is incredible: though no man can tell why a person who increases in strength every year for forty years, might not under favorable conditions live on indefinitely; nor why humanity, fresh from its Creator's hands, untainted by vices and excesses, and with the energies of divine life yet unspent, should not continue to live on for centuries. Indeed, such ancient writers as Manetho, who wrote Egyptian history; Berosus, who wrote the history of Chaldea; and the Grecian writers, Hesiod, Hecatæus, and Ephorus, testify that in the earliest ages of the world men lived to be nearly a thousand years old.

There are also traditions and records of great longevity in the ages succeeding the times of Noah. Eratosthenes, the astronomer and geometer, who was born B. C. 276, and lived some eighty years and who, during the reigns of Ptolemy Euergetes, and his successor, was for many years superintendent of the great library at Alexandria,—the largest collection of ancient literature the world has ever seen,—in his account of the kings of Egypt, compiled at the request of Ptolemy, and drawn, of course, from the boundless stores of literature at his command, which he compared with the original records kept at Thebes; states that Menes,—who is believed to be identical with Mizraim, the son of Ham,—the first king of Egypt, reigned sixty-two years, and died at the age of 252, being lamented by the Egyptians as having been cut off in the flower of his age. His successor, Thoth reigned fifty-nine years, and lived to the age of 276 years; he was cotemporary with Arphaxad, who lived 438 years. A later king, Amachus, reigned seventy-nine years, and Apappus, the twentieth king, reigned one hundred years.*

* Arthur Bedford's *Scripture Chronology*, page 62.

The Chinese chronology also gives us similar information. Beginning with Fohi, the first king of China, who is believed to have been the same as Noah, and of whose great age the Chinese records make mention: it is said that he reigned one hundred and fifteen years. His successor Zinnum, reigned one hundred and forty years, Hoanti reigned a hundred years, and died at the age of a hundred and eleven. Zaohao reigned eighty-four years, and died at the age of one hundred. Chuenhio reigned seventy-eight years, and died at the age of ninety-one. Tico reigned seventy years, and lived a hundred and five years. Yao, who is believed to have been cotemporary with Moses, reigned one hundred years, and died at the age of a hundred and eighteen. Zun reigned fifty years, and lived a hundred and ten years.* These long reigns and long lives correspond quite closely with the lives of the patriarchs of the same date.

In like manner the story of the deluge finds confirmation in the records and traditions of all nations ancient and modern. The account of the confusion of tongues at Babel, furnishes the only explanation of the existence of thousands of languages in which people of one blood express the same thoughts, ideas and affections; and the account of the dispersion and genealogy of the race (Genesis x., xi.) helps us to trace all nations to their origin.

It has been claimed that the Mosaic law was written, compiled, and published by Ezra, or some one about his time. The book of Ezra records the fact of Ezra's *reading* the law of Moses, and giving the sense distinctly, in the presence of the assembled people who had returned from Babylon, some of whom were so old that they remembered the temple at Jerusalem which had been destroyed seventy years before; but the record says nothing about Ezra *forging* the law of Moses, or inventing the ritual; nor could such a forgery have passed unchallenged before such an assembly. On the other hand the people hearing this law repented of the sins which it condemned, lamented their violation of the Mosaic precepts, and made haste to renew their covenant with God, and keep the commandments which their fathers had disobeyed. And the prophet Malachi, who lived very near the time of Ezra, and who might be supposed to know as much about what was done in Ezra's time as modern critics who lived thousands of years later, and thousands of miles distant; knew nothing about the invention of the Pentateuch by Ezra or any of his cotemporaries, but the Word of the Lord which he uttered, was, "Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments." Mal. iv. 4

* Arthur Bedford's *Scripture Chronology*, pp. 76–82.

The prominence given to Egypt in the Hebrew Scriptures, is utterly inexplicable unless great wonders were wrought "in the land of Ham" in the days of Israel's early history. Egypt is mentioned in the Old Testament 683 times, and the Egyptians thirty times; and the references to the land of Egypt, its cities, rulers, customs, sins, and idolatries, are unnumbered. Egypt was the background of Israel's history, which fact alone can explain the Hebrew Scriptures, which shine on every page with the light of the flaming pillar and the guiding cloud. The Hebrew prophets and teachers were not all of them masters of the art of realistic fiction; and the scribe with his weary and yet persistent pen could offer no such golden temptations to the inventors of religious fictions as are held out by the enterprising publishers of the present day. The countless references to Egypt would have baffled the skill of the most astute inventor of history and prophecy; and yet lynx-eyed criticism, after searching for a century among tombs, temples, pyramids, obelisks, and inscriptions, though determined to find contradictions, only finds confirmations; and confesses the accuracy and genuineness of the Hebrew Records.

Wilkinson's "*Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians,*" in its three volumes, has references to Scripture on more than 230 pages. Dr. Brugsch in his "*History of Egypt under the Pharaohs,*" quotes more than one hundred passages of Scripture, illustrating and confirming its statements; and says: (vol. ii. p. 330), "any one must certainly be blind who refuses to see the flood of light which the papyri and the other Egyptian monuments are throwing on the venerable records of the Holy Scripture."

The spade of the explorer exhibits to us not only "The Castle of the Jew's Daughters," the ruined palace of Pharaoh-hophra, at Tahpanhes, whither the daughters of king Zedekiah fled for asylum (Jer. xliii.); but also disinters Pithom the treasure city which the Israelites built, and exhibits the bricks they made and laid there. From the walls of the Temple of Shishonk at Karnak there still look down upon us the Jewish profiles of the captives which Shishak took from Palestine in the days of Solomon's foolish son, Rehoboam; and the names of the cities he conquered are still inscribed upon those temple walls. 2 Chron. xii. 1–8. Each new discovery answers some skeptical cavil, or removes some honest doubt. And yet, after all this, the Higher Critic asks us to believe that these books are a series of "cunningly devised fables," that they are fictitious, legendary, and unhistorical; and that they were invented by men who knew little or nothing about Egypt, and who, out of a few vague, mythical legends, have constructed this

marvellously compacted mass of history and prophecy, on which has beat the burning light of scrutiny and investigation for two thousand years, but which is now expected to evaporate in the crucible of the Higher Criticism of the nineteenth century, notwithstanding the fact that every year new discoveries, coincidences, and confirmations more firmly establish the truthfulness of these ancient documents.

One fact worthy of notice is the measurement of time given in the Mosaic account of the flood. The flood is described as having lasted one hundred and fifty days, from the seventeenth day of the second month to the seventeenth day of the seventh month. This would make five months of *thirty days each.* The only known calendar which had twelve months of thirty days is the ancient Egyptian calendar, which had twelve months of thirty days, and then five intercalary days to fill out the year. During the time of the second temple the Jews used months of thirty and twenty-nine days, and the fact that the book of Genesis reckons months of *thirty days* each, indicates that it was written soon after the Exode from Egypt, and while that method of counting time was fresh in the minds of the people.

Time and space would not admit the presentation of a tithe of the facts which confirm the statements and indicate the antiquity of the Pentateuch, But it seems proper to cite

ONE INDEPENDENT WITNESS

to the authenticity and great antiquity of these venerable writings.

On the walls of the fallen palace of Khorsabad, among the ruins of buried Nineveh, Austen Henry Layard about the year 1845 discovered a sculptured representation of the siege of Samaria, which was pictured as a fortress around which mounds had been erected, from which soldiers assailed and captured the city. The account of this siege is recorded among the exploits of Shalmaneser, who commenced it about 724 B. C., two years before his death. The siege continued three years, the city finally falling in the first year of the reign of Sargon,—who succeeded Shalmaneser, claiming to be the descendant of "the three hundred and fifty kings of Assyria," and reigned from 722 to 705 B. C.

In Dr. Eberhard Schrader's *Cuneiform Inscriptions of the Old Testament,* Translated by Owen C. Whitehouse, are found the following statements from the Great Triumphal Inscription of Sargon, corresponding with the Scripture account in 2 Kings xvii:

"The city Samaria I besieged, I captured; 27,280 of its inhabitants I carried away; 50 chariots of them I took [for myself], their

remaining effects I caused [my subalterns] to take; my viceroy I placed over them, the tribute of the former king I imposed on them."—Vol. I. p. 264.

Another inscription, much mutilated, apparently recounts the same events: "In the begining . . . . of the Samaritans . . . . I carried away; 50 chariots I took as my royal share. . . . . in the place of them [the deported] I assigned abodes to the inhabitants of countries taken [by me]. I imposed tribute on them like Assyria."—p. 266.

The Annals of Sargon for the first year of his reign record that "[Merodach Baladan], whom since he, not according to the will of the gods, the rule over Babel [had seized for himself, I overcame in war and smote] . . . . seven inhabitants—together with their property I transported and settled them [in the land] Chatti."—i. e. of the Hittites—the land of Israel. p. 268.

Another Cylinder Inscription reads: [Sargon], who the people of Tamud, Ibadid, Marsiman, Chajap, the remainder of whom was carried away, and whom he transported to *the land of Bit Omri*"—i. e. the land of Omri, in Palestine. p. 269.

Again, in the Annals of Sargon's seventh year B. C., 715, he says: "They of Tamud, Ibadid, Marsiman, Chajap, the Arbaeans, the distant who inhabit the land of Bari, whom no scholar and messenger-sender has known, who to the kings my fathers never had offered their tribute; in confidence on Asur, my lord, I subjugated them, their remnants I transplanted, and settled in the city Samaria." p. 270.

In the words of Schrader, "Thus the inscriptions place the fact in the clearest light that Sargon settled subjugated tribes in Samaria. Now, in the passage first cited from the Annals, Babylonians are represented as being deported to the *Land of Chatti*, which, as we have seen already, included Northern Israel; while the Bible represents Babylonians as being quartered in Samaria. There cannot therefore be any doubt that the settlement of the Babylonian population to which the Bible refers, is that which is reported in Sargon's Annals as having occurred in the first year of his reign, i. e. 721 B. C. This deportation, however, was subsequently followed by later detachments, perhaps on several occasions, at all events in the seventh year of Sargon's reign, 715 B. C. We find Sargon also in other instances carrying out repeated deportations of population to one and the same place." p. 270.

The counterpart of these Assyrian Records taken from the walls of the palaces of Nineveh, may be found recorded in the Jewish Scriptures, in the seventeenth chapter of the second book of Kings, which thus refers to the same transactions:

"Hoshea reigned in Samaria over Israel nine years, and did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord." "Against him came up Shalmaneser king of Assyria; and Hoshea became his servant, and gave him presents." Afterward Hoshea conspired with the king of Egypt, and sought to throw off the Assyrian yoke. Then the king of Assyria took Hoshea captive, and shut him up, and bound him in prison; and invaded the land of Israel and besieged Samaria three years. In the ninth year of Hoshea, "the king of Assyria," whose name is not here given, but who was Sargon, who had succeeded Shalmaneser, "took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria, and placed them in Halah and in Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes." This was declared to be in punishment for their sins, for "The Lord testified against Israel, and against Judah, by all the prophets, and by all the seers, saying, Turn ye from your evil ways, and keep my *commandments* and my *statutes*, according to *all the law* which I *commanded your fathers*, and which I sent to you by my servants the prophets. Notwithstanding, they would not hear, but hardened their necks, like to the neck of their fathers, that did not believe in the Lord their God. And they rejected His *statutes* and His *covenant* that He made with their fathers, and His *testimonies* which He testified against them; and they followed vanity, and became vain, and went after the heathen that were round about them, concerning whom the Lord had charged them, that they should not do like them. And they left all the commandments of the Lord their God, and made them molten images, even two calves, and made a grove, and worshiped all the host of heaven, and served Baal. And they caused their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire, and used divination and enchantments, and sold themselves to do evil in the sight of the Lord, to provoke Him to anger. Therefore the Lord was very angry with Israel, and removed them out of His sight: there was none left but the tribe of Judah only. Also Judah kept *not* the *commandments* of the Lord their God, but walked in the *statutes of Israel* which *they* made." "So was Israel carried away out of their own land to Assyria. And the king of Assyria brought men from Babylon, and from Cuthah, and from Ava, and from Hamath, and from Sepharvaim, and *placed them in the cities of Samaria*, instead of the children of Israel: and they possessed Samaria, and dwelt in the cities thereof."

This portion of the land of Israel was thus stripped of the bulk of its own inhabitants, who had sinned in disobeying *the law which God had given them*, and whose national unity was thus broken up by deportation and dispersion. Their territory was then re-peopled from

other regions, by other races who had been conquered, who, in accordance with this same policy, were carried from their own homes to the land of Israel and planted there. Of course they brought with them all the superstitions, errors, and idolatries of heathenism, which they continued to practice in the land of Israel. From some cause calamities overtook them. The author of the book of Kings says, "And so it was at the beginning of their dwelling there, that they feared not the Lord; therefore the Lord sent lions among them, which slew some of them." This state of things led them to consideration, "Wherefore they spake to the king of Assyria, saying, The nations which thou hast removed, and placed in the cities of Samaria, *know not the manner of the God of the land:* therefore he hath sent lions among them, and behold they slay them, because they *know not the manner of the God of the land.*" This was quite in accordance with the general opinion of those times, when men believed that certain gods were the special protectors of certain kingdoms and nations. The Assyrian king was disposed to consider their condition, recognized the justness of their conclusions, and speedily devised a remedy. "Then the king of Assyria commanded, saying, *Carry thither one of the priests whom ye brought from thence;* and let them go and dwell there, and let him *teach them the manner of the God of the land.* Then *one of the priests* whom they had carried away from Samaria, *came and dwelt in Bethel,* and *taught* them *how they should fear the Lord.*" But these inhabitants of Samaria were not Israelites, nor did they propose to abandon their hereditary idolatries. They simply added the God of Israel to the list of deities which they worshiped, and while "every nation made gods of their own," they still gave a partial recognition to the God of Israel. And so they "made unto themselves of the lowest of them priests of the high places, which sacrificed for them in the houses of the high places. They *feared* the Lord, and *served* their own gods, after the manner of the nations from among whom they had been carried away." *Revised Version.* They thus continued their idolatries and their mongrel worship, and the writer declares that "Unto *this day* they do after the former manners: they fear not the Lord, neither do they after their *statutes,* or after their *ordinances,* or after the *law* and *commandment* which the Lord *commanded the children of Jacob,* whom He named Israel; with whom the Lord had made a covenant, and charged them, saying,—Ye shall not fear other gods, nor bow yourselves to them, nor serve them, nor sacrifice to them: . . . And the *statutes,* and the *ordinances,* and the *law,* and the *commandment which He* WROTE *for you,* ye shall observe to do for evermore, and ye shall not fear other gods."

About half a century later, there seems to have been another deportation of foreigners into Samaria by Esar-haddon King of Assyria, the son and successor of Sennacherib. Ezra iv. 2 At this time the worship of the God of Israel, doubtless in a corrupted form, seems to have predominated, if we may believe the Samaritans themselves, who claimed to have offered sacrifices to the God of Israel "since the days of Esar-haddon." Ezra iv. 2.

We thus gather from the ancient monuments of the Ninevites, confirmed by the parallel records of the Jewish people, these facts, (1) that the Ten Tribes prior to 722 B. C., had the LORD'S "statutes," "ordinances," "law," and "commandments which he WROTE," (2 Ki. xvii. 37); by which they were taught the fear of God; (2) that they disregarded this law, and for their neglect of it were doomed to captivity; (3) that their nation was overthrown, and that they were carried into distant lands, their places being filled with heathen nations; (4) that in consequence of the troubles which these heathen encountered, they determined to seek the protection of the God of Israel; (5) that one of the priests of Israel was brought back to teach these untrained heathen how to fear and worship the Most High God; (6) that as they retained their idolatries, and refused to submit wholly to the law of God, a mingled and corrupt form of worship prevailed among them; (7) that from the days of Esar-haddon they offered sacrifices to the God of Israel.

About a hundred and thirty-four years after the conquest of Samaria by Sargon, Jerusalem was taken by Nebuchadnezzar, and the Jews themselves were carried away captive to Babylon. After seventy years they returned to undertake the rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem, in which work this mixed community of Samaritans, in whom Idolatry seems to have decayed under the influence of the law of God, desired to unite with them. Ezra iv. 1–2. Their assistance being refused, they then exerted themselves to prevent the rebuilding of the temple and the walls. Josephus (*Antiq.* Bk. xi. ch. viii.), informs us that they welcomed criminals or refugees from Jerusalem, which of course would be displeasing to the Jews; and, repelled from worshiping at Jerusalem, they finally erected a rival temple on Mount Gerizim, where Mannasseh, brother of Jaddua the Jewish high priest, and son-in-law of Sanballat the governor of Samaria, presided,—he having refused to dissolve his unlawful marriage, and having thus left the Jews and joined the Samaritans. This temple remained till it was destroyed by John Hyrcanus, B. C. 130.

Now as "*unto this day*," when 2 Kings xvii. 34 was *written*, the Samaritans retained their heathenish ways of worship, it is evident

that 2 Kings xvii. 34 was written before the days of Ezra, at which time the Samaritans were anxious to unite with the Jews in building the second temple and in worshiping the God of Israel to whom they had offered sacrifice "since the days of Esarhaddon." Ezra iv. 2.

The worship of the ten tribes had been corrupted by "the statutes of Israel which they made." 2 Ki. xvii. 19. For this apostacy "the Lord removed Israel out of his sight, as he had said by all his servants the prophets." 2 Ki. xvii. 23. And as the captive priest was brought back to teach the Samaritan colonists "the manner of the God of the land" (2 Ki. xvii. 26), that they might escape the calamities which had overtaken them in their idolatry, it cannot be supposed that he would instruct them in the calf worship of Bethel for which Israel had just been carried into captivity, and so plunge them into still deeper troubles; but rather that he would teach them the law and commandments and statutes which had brought peace to the sons of Israel so long as they obeyed them. But to teach these statutes and laws and judgments, he *must have had a copy of the Pentateuch;* and the fact that before the time of Ezra this mingled people had been won from their idolatries to the worship of the one God of Israel, shows that they must have been instructed out of the Mosaic Law, which had subdued their idolatries and powerfully influenced their lives.

The refusal of the Jewish rulers to allow so large an alien element as the Samaritans to incorporate itself in the Jewish nation, which thus must have lost its racial purity, resulted in much bitterness of feeling, which was increased by other circumstances, until the Jews had "no dealings with the Samaritans." John iv. 9. Matthew in his Gospel, written especially for the Jewish converts, notes the fact that at their first going forth Christ said to his disciples, "Into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not." Matt. x. 5. Yet the Saviour himself was not unwilling to enter "into a village of the Samaritans," though "they did not receive him, because his face was as though he would go to Jerusalem." Luke ix. 52-53. The Saviour had no prejudice against the Samaritans. He visited Sychar, a city of Samaria, and there told the woman of Samaria of the water of life which he gave, and revealed to her first the secret of his Messiahship. John iv. 26. And yielding to the entreaties of the Samaritans "He abode there two days, and many more believed because of his own word," saying: We have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world." John iv. 42. He took note of the fact that of the ten lepers cleansed only one, who returned to give glory to God, was a "stranger,"—a Samaritan. Luke xvii. 11-18. He taught the

catechising, quibbling Jewish lawyer his lesson concerning love to his neighbor by the example of "a certain Samaritan," whose kindness he has embodied and embalmed in the story of the man who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho and fell among thieves. Luke x. 29–37. Indeed his friendliness for the Samaritans seems to have provoked the criticism of the Jews, who said, "Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil?" John viii. 48. The last sentence that he spoke to his disciples was, "Ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in *Samaria*, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." Acts i. 8. And his disciples when persecuted "were scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judæa and Samaria," and "preached the gospel in many villages of the Samaritans." Acts viii. 1, 25. There Philip preached, and Samaria "received the word of God;" and thus a portion of that people were called out into that new fraternity, the church of the living God. The Samaritan people, however retained their existence as a nation or tribe, distinct alike from Jews, and Christians, Greeks and Romans.

In the time of the Roman Emperor Vespasian they revolted, and 11,600 of them were slain; and from that time they maintained a troubled and contentious existence, being equally at variance with Jews and Christians. In 1099 they came under the power of the Crusaders, remaining under Christian domination most of the time to 1244, when they passed under Mohammedan rule. Since 1517 they have been subject to the Turks.

Near the close of the fifteenth century Joseph Justus Scaliger (A. D. 1540—1609), the tenth of the fifteen children of the learned Julius Cæsar Scaliger,—a man who if not learned in all the wisdom of modern times, was yet able to speak thirteen languages, read many others with facility, and repeat the Greek poets from memory,—remembering some of the references to the Samaritans in earlier writers, addressed letters to the two Samaritan congregations at Nablus and Cairo. Answers to these letters were returned after Scaliger's death, and were translated into Latin by John Morin, and given to the public. This long-forgotten people was thus brought to public notice, and they have since been repeatedly visited. They dwell near by Jacob's well at Shechem, or Nablus,—a corruption of Neapolis or New-Town, which was built by Vespasian a little west of the older town, that was then in ruins.

The Samaritans still number about one hundred and fifty persons. They are probably the *oldest community on earth* which has maintained its existence uninterruptedly in the same place. Israel has been scattered among all nations; Jerusalem has been trodden

under foot of the Gentiles; Christians have been persecuted and dispersed; empires have risen and fallen; but the Samaritans still linger in their ancestral seat, and perpetuate the traditions that have come down to them from the far off past. Why have they thus been preserved?

In connection with the re-appearance of the Samaritans on the stage of history, it was remembered that some of the early fathers, as Eusebius, Jerome, Cyril, of Alexandria, Procopius of Gaza, and others, had recorded the fact that these Samaritans were possessors of the Five Books of Moses. This fact had been lost sight of for a thousand years, but in 1616 Pietro della Valle obtained a copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch from the Samaritans in Damascus. De Sancy the French ambassador at Constantinople, sent this manuscript to the library of the Oratore in Paris, in 1623, and it was published in Le Jay's Paris Polyglot of 1645, by John Morin, or Morinus. In addition to this there was discovered a Samaritan *version* of the Pentateuch, a different work, in the Samaritan dialect, which resembles both the Chaldee and the Syriac, and which is also of great antiquity. This also was first printed by Le Jay in the Paris Polyglot, and was regarded as older than the schism between the Jews and Samaritans. After this issue of the Samaritan Pentateuch in 1645, Archbishop Usher obtained six additional manuscript copies from the East, and by the aid of these and the Parisian Polyglot, Brian Walton printed a corrected edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch in the London Polyglot of 1657. In the time of Benjamin Kennicott, 1718–1783, other copies had been discovered, so that as many as sixteen Samaritan manuscripts were accessible, and were collated by Kennicott for his critical edition of the Hebrew Bible.

This Samaritan Pentateuch, while it has certain variations, often agreeing with the Septuagint, and shows some marks of alteration is to all intents and purposes essentially the same as the Five Books of Moses in the possession of the Jews. It is in the Hebrew tongue, but in an older style of letters than the Jews now use. Now where did the Samaritans get these Five Books? They did not get them from the Christians, for the Samaritan community was far older than the Christian church. They did not get them from the Jews, for the Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans. They did not get them in the days of Nehemiah, for at that time the two communities were at open variance, the Jews rejecting the overtures of the Samaritans, and the Samaritans exerting themselves to hinder the Jews in rebuilding their desolate city and temple. They could hardly have got them from the Jews while

the Jews were in captivity in Babylon. Whence then did they derive these books? The book of Joshua was an ancient book, written before the time of David and Solomon, as we learn by comparing Josh. xv. 63, with 2 Sam. v. 6–9; and Josh. xvi. 10, with 1 Ki. ix. 16. But the Samaritans do not have the book of Joshua, nor indeed any of the prophets, they have simply the *Five Books of Moses;* and those books, our critical friends insist, were invented, forged, or manufactured somewhere in the time of Hezekiah, or Jeremiah, or Josiah, or Ezra, or somebody else, nobody knows when, or where, or by whom.

The Higher Critic tells us that "the original of the Samaritan Pentateuch" was "brought from Jerusalem by Manasseh," "a copy of the Pentateuch that Manasseh carried with him."* It is much easier to assert this twice than it is to prove it once; and so the critic chose the easier course. Not a vestige of evidence is adduced for the assertion; though its truthfulness is essential to the existence of many of the modern critical theories; but ordinary Bible readers are expected to believe this statement solely on the bare assertion of a Higher Critic, who speaks "as one having authority, and not as the scribes." What proof he has that not a single copy of the Pentateuch remained in the land of Israel, after the bulk of the Ten Tribes were carried away, he does not say; what evidence he has that the priest who was carried back to Samaria "to teach them how to fear the LORD," had no copy of the Pentateuch, he does not state; nor does he inform us by what means the Samaritans, destitute of the divine law, had been led to sacrifice to the God of Israel for more than a century; nor has he told us why the Samaritans in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah should desire to unite with the Jews in the worship of a God whose law they had never seen, and which, in fact, was only a recent invention; nor why they, smarting under the rejection of their overtures made to the Jews, should now adopt the newly forged law and ritual of a nation which had spurned their friendship, and with whom they were at variance. Nor does he give a reason why Manasseh should carry with him to Samaria a copy of a law which he must have known was a recent forgery invented by lying priests, —a law which he himself had disregarded and refused to submit to,—and the provisions of which had already caused his exile from his own people; or why Manasseh, going from Jerusalem to Samaria three or four hundred years before Christ, did not take with him a "Hexateuch" instead of a "Pentateuch," with all the other prophecies, forgeries, and fictions which had recently been trumped

* C. A Briggs in *Johnson's Cyclopedia*, article, *Samaritans.*

up and imposed upon the Jewish people. All such questions the Higher Critic discreetly overlooks. Hence we lose the assistance of his oracular utterances in settling these vital issues.

From the sources of information at our command it appears that about two hundred and seventy-five years before the time of Nehemiah, the Ten Tribes were carried away into captivity for serving idols, and thus disobeying the command of God, who had said unto them, "Ye shall not do this thing. Yet the Lord testified against Israel and against Judah, by all the prophets, and by all the seers, saying, Turn ye from your evil ways, and keep my *commandments* and my *statutes*, according to all the *law* which I commanded your fathers, and which I sent to you by my servants the prophets. Notwithstanding they would not hear, but hardened their necks, . . . and they rejected his *statutes*, and his *covenant* that he made with their fathers, and his *testimonies* which he testified against them, . . . and they left all the *commandments* of the Lord their God, and made them molten images, even two calves, and made a grove, and worshiped all the host of heaven, and served Baal." "And the *statutes*, and the *ordinances*, and the *law*, and the *commandment*, which HE WROTE for" them, they disobeyed, "therefore the Lord was very angry with Israel, and removed them out of his sight: there was none left but the tribe of Judah only." 2 Ki. xvii.

Having thus cleared the land of the people who disregarded the *Law* which God "*wrote*" for them, the Assyrian king replanted it with heathen captives from the East, who, being afflicted with wild beasts, presented their petition to the king; whereupon he commanded that one of the priests whom they had carried away from Samaria should be brought back, who "came and dwelt in Bethel, and *taught them how they should fear Jehovah*." It would seem necessary that this teacher of the fear of the Lord should have a text book containing that written law, for disobeying which Israel had been sent into captivity; and as the only such book in existence was the Pentateuch, he must necessarily have carried that with him. He did not need the historical writings, nor did he need the 'Hexateuch,' nor do the Samaritans have it to this day. His people, the Ten Tribes, had revolted from the tyranny of Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, and had broken off all connection with the house of David; hence they had no interest in David's Psalms or Solomon's Proverbs; and when one of their number went back to teach these new settlers "the manner of the God of Israel," he needed only a copy of the Mosaic law. This was the only portion of the Jewish Scriptures which the Samaritans have ever received. This they *did* receive, and under its influence they were won back from idolatry, and

from "the days of Esarhaddon" offered sacrifices to the God of Israel. And through all the vicissitudes of ages this unique little commonwealth, differing from all the nations and races of the earth, has guarded this sacred treasure, the Mosaic Law. They evidently had it in the days when Nineveh exalted itself in its splendor as the capital of the mighty Assyrian empire; they have it now when Nineveh is "empty, and void, and waste," and when the shepherds of Assyria slumber, her nobles dwell in the dust, and her people are scattered upon the mountains, and no man gathereth them. Nahum ii. iii. They had it when Babylon was the glory of the Chaldees' excellency, the lady of kingdoms, the most splendid city on the face of the earth; they have it to-day when Babylon is heaps, desolate, and forsaken. They had it in the times when Persia spread her power and built her palaces; they have it now when that power is broken, and those palaces and cities are in ruins. They had it in the days of Grecian dominion, when Alexander and his successors ruled; they have it still, when Alexander's empire is but a dream of the past. They had it when Rome was the proud mistress of the world, and her eagles hastened like vultures to prey upon them; and now when mighty Rome has fallen, and the glory of the Cæsars has forever passed, within the whitewashed walls of the tiny synagogue of Nablus, in a silver case, is still carefully guarded the age-worn manuscript of the Samaritan Pentateuch. The priests in charge of it know or care nothing about the squabbles of the Higher Critics, the forgeries of "post-exilic" scriptures, or the work of the dozens of "redactors" that the Higher Critics have discovered or invented. They are indifferent to the opinions of Jews or Gentiles; but they call themselves "the Shomerim," or custodians of the Law; and they guard that old time-stained manuscript, which they declare has been handed down to them from Eleazar, the third son of Aaron; and while nations and empires have risen and fallen, decayed and perished, this little flock, guarding this Law of Moses, and paying heed to the precepts, has outlived races, and empires, and dynasties, and still retains its existence as a witness for this ancient Law.

The Higher Critics dissect this Law as the spurious production of Jewish priests and patriotic liars, who forged it after the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity; but they are met by *this copy of the Pentateuch* providentially placed for safe keeping in the hands of the Samaritans some twenty-five hundred years ago; and when the Law of Moses, having fallen among the Higher Critics, lies stripped and wounded, and half dead, the Good Samaritan comes as of old, to bind up the wounds, and pour in oil and wine.

And we have not only the testimony of the Samaritans, but that of the scattered sons of Israel. In *Principles of Biblical Criticism*, p. 244, J. J. Lias says, "I have recently seen a communication from the Jews of Yemen, Arabia, to those in Jerusalem, in which the former state, that their ancestors never returned to Judea after the captivity. Yet their version of the Scriptures is precisely identical with that of their brethren." Who forged *their* Scriptures?

The criticisms of the Higher Critics are not entirely new. Many of them are simply Old Wine in New Bottles, the skepticism of the past masquerading as the Christianity of the present. Celsus and Porphyry, Voltaire and Paine, Astruc and Strauss have had their day and said their say. And whatever their personal characters may have been, any facts or arguments which they offer are entitled to fair, candid, dispassionate investigation. It does not disprove a man's argument to prove that he is a knave or hypocrite. He may be all this, and yet he may present difficulties which demand careful investigation. So the Higher Critics of the present day are entitled to a fair and candid hearing. If they were a trifle less oracular and omniscient in their attitude and tone, they might be more agreeable instructors, for humanity learns best of those who are "meek and lowly in heart." Nevertheless facts are facts, and facts will stand, however they are stated; truth will prevail however imperfectly it may be declared. But "he that believeth shall not make haste," and those who *do* make haste in such important matters, sometimes reach disastrous conclusions.

It is easy to cut a boat adrift from its moorings, but who can tell what currents will bear it away, or on what rocks it may at last be wrecked? So it may be easy to unsettle the faith of honest but ill taught souls, but who shall answer for the results?* Whether the Higher Critics of the present day will ever follow their own premises to their legitimate conclusions or not we cannot say; but some of their disciples will be sure to do it; and though the inventors and disseminators of doubt and uncertainty are not likely to abandon their posts, sacrifice their salaries, or desist from praising the Scriptures whose authority they have so thoroughly undermined; yet many common sense readers will not be likely to long retain a reverence for exploded fictions, nor accept a volume of forged laws, priestly inventions, pious frauds, and old-wives fables, as a divine revelation and an infallible rule of faith and practice. And the amount of mischief which may result from the broadcast sowing of

* "A statement has been widely circulated in the public press, that the number of persons in Germany who this year declared themselves to be of *no religion* is *fourteen times as great* as in 1871. Is there no connection between this fact and the manner in which German criticism has treated the Bible?" —*Principles of Biblical Criticism, by J. J. Lias*, p. 216.

undigested theories and critical cavilings, no mortal can estimate. In closing a sermon before the students of Cornell University, Dr. J. M. Buckley, editor of *The Christian Advocate*, said:

"A series of sermons was published in Scotland, teaching that almost everything held to be fundamental to Christian faith had, by the researches of modern scholarship, been found untenable, and speaking of what remains in an indefinite way. These discourses were republished in the United States. Among those who read and accepted them was a woman in the city of New York, of great intelligence and intellectuality and of high culture.

"A year or two later she removed to a suburb upon the Hudson River, continuing to attend the Presbyterian Church, but frankly informing the pastor that she had lost faith, and attributing the change to those discourses. Afterwards she became ill and died of a lingering disease. During the months of steady but not rapid progress to the grave, the pastor frequently visited her, making every effort to re-establish her faith in the simple provisions of the gospel, but in vain. To the last she said that she knew nothing and was *not able to believe anything positively*. So much had been shaken that she was not certain there was anything that could not be shaken.

"Less than a year after her death, the author of those sermons was summoned to trial for heresy. When the charges were submitted he asked a little time for reconsideration, and submitted a statement that when he prepared those discourses he believed them, but further reflection had convinced him that he had erred in taking many things for granted that had not been proved, deducing conclusions that were not warranted even by his premises, and expressing himself in an unguarded manner, and that he desired to retract several of the discourses in whole, and in part all but one or two.

"*But the woman who had given up her faith in the essentials of the gospel for faith in him, had died in darkness.*"

Those who watch for souls as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy and not with grief, cannot shirk their responsibilities. They must meet hereafter those whom they have "nourished up in words of faith and sound doctrine," or whom they have blindly misled into devious and dangerous paths. And the Master to whom we all must give account has said, "It is impossible but that offences will come, but woe unto him through whom they come. It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck and he cast into the sea, than that he SHOULD OFFEND ONE of THESE LITTLE ONES." Luke xvii. 2.

SCRIPTURAL TRACT REPOSITORY, 47 CORNHILL, BOSTON, MASS.

A STUDY OF THE PENTATEUCH.
INTRODUCTORY.

A STUDY OF THE PENTATEUCH

FOR POPULAR READING:

BEING AN INQUIRY INTO THE AGE OF THE SO-CALLED BOOKS OF MOSES, WITH AN INTRODUCTORY EXAMINATION OF RECENT DUTCH THEORIES, AS REPRESENTED BY DR. KUENEN'S "RELIGION OF ISRAEL."

BY

RUFUS P. STEBBINS, D. D.,

Late President, Lecturer on Hebrew Literature, and Professor of Theology in the Meadville Theological School.

Second Edition.

SCRIPTURAL TRACT REPOSITORY:

H. L. HASTINGS, BOSTON, MASS., No. 47 CORNHILL. | MARSHALL BROS., AGTS., LONDON, 10 PATERNOSTER ROW, E. C.

1895.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

Standing in the drift and whirl of modern research, investigation, and discovery, and observing the remarkable results reached by students and critics, considerate people are sometimes led to inquire, "Will there be anything left when Criticism has completely done its work?" And this question seems more natural from the fact that much of the investigation and criticism of the day is claimed to be the work of trained experts, whose processes are held to be beyond the understanding or judgment of ordinary observers, who must simply accept conclusions which they have neither opportunity nor ability to verify.

In matters of exact science, the conclusions of professional experts are usually accepted with little question, even though they are subject to frequent revisions; but in the case of moral, religious, and eternal verities, the prudent man hesitates; partly because of the importance of the questions involved; partly because the experts themselves seem to agree in nothing except in contradicting the conclusions which he has believed to be well grounded; and partly because he has in his own experience a knowledge of certain of the matters involved in the controversy, to which he believes that some at least of these critical experts may be strangers, and without which they can hardly be accepted as authoritative interpreters of all the facts in the case.

Under such circumstances the prudent man, instead of incontinently accepting the contradictory theories of a dozen Higher Critics, falls back upon his experience, his observation, and his common sense; and investigates for himself as far as he is able; being aided therein by others whose studies have qualified them to instruct him,—though their investigations may not have led them so far from their customary orbit as some of the "wandering stars" which are so often flashing out amid the darkness of night, and fading into forgetfulness before the morning's dawn.

Among those who have discussed the question of the origin of the Hebrew Scriptures, the author of "*A Study of the Pentateuch*," has certain claims to the attention of the candid enquirer. A

conservative representative of a somewhat radical school of thinkers, he occupied a platform where the most absolute freedom of opinion and speech was tolerated, and his position as a teacher and leader in such a fraternity placed him beyond the fear of censure, or the temptation to stifle his convictions, or suppress his honest conclusions.*

In discussing the origin of the Five Books of Moses, he was entirely untrammelled. He was under no obligations to reach the conclusions he reached, or defend the position he had taken. He was retained by no party, and was bound by no creed, confession, vow, pledge, or promise to maintain the position he assumed. He was entirely free to study the facts in the case, and declare the

*Rufus Phineas Stebbins was born March 3, 1810, in South Wilbraham, Mass. Of humble parentage, he grew up under the discipline of poverty and hard work. His mother was a devoted Christian, at a time when the somewhat frigid orthodoxy of the Puritans was being touched by the fervor of old time Methodism, which had a stronghold in Wilbraham Academy, of which Wilbur Fisk was principal in his early years. Rufus in his early days was strong, vigorous, and athletic. He spent his summers upon the farm, his winters in the public school or in the academy; taught school, and at the age of twenty entered Amherst College,—a classmate of Henry Ward Beecher,—with whom he graduated at the age of twenty-four. Embracing the opinions of Dr. Channing, he entered the Divinity School at Cambridge, with Henry Ware, J. G. Palfrey, and Andrews Norton as teachers, and E. H. Sears, H. W. Bellows, C. A. Bartol, as fellow-students. He graduated in the class of 1837, was united in marriage with Miss Eliza Livermore, of Cambridge, a sister of the well known scholar, George Livermore, and became pastor of the church in Leominster in 1837, where he spent seven years preaching, teaching, preparing boys for college, etc. In 1844 he was called to the presidency of the Meadville Theological School, where he remained twelve years, going from thence to a pastorate in Woburn, Mass., in 1856, where he remained eight years. The next six years were spent in Cambridge, and in occasional preaching in other regions round about, after which he removed to Ithaca, N. Y., spending seven years preaching and lecturing upon theological subjects. In 1877 he removed to Newton Center, where he preached for nearly eight years.

He possessed a sound mind, a sound body, an indomitable will, tireless energy, strong, positive views, a Puritan's sternness of exterior, with warm sympathies, and the genial, trustful heart of a child. In a ministry of forty-eight years he only lost one Sunday by sickness. "As a preacher," says one who knew him from boyhood, "he delighted in the Commandments, and his honest, burning, indignant soul would have liked it better if there had been three or four more. As a young man he drove his burning plowshare through old fields whose habits and sins had pastured peacefully together for generations. . . . As a teacher he belonged to that class of minds who deal with the definite and the positive. His opinions were deliberately formed, steadfastly entertained, and honestly and unflinchingly expressed."

He died suddenly at Cambridgeport, August 13th, 1885. When told that the end was near, he was not surprised nor alarmed. He said, "I have had a long and happy life, a very happy life, I have no desire to live but to care for my wife. I have no last words to speak. Everything has been said that needs to be said," and so he fell asleep. The old physician who watched over him said, "I can truly pray that my last end may be like his."

truth as he found it, without fear of censure, ostracism, or condemnation, and no accusation of insincerity or inconsistency could be brought against him for so doing.

Under such circumstances he undertook to investigate and ascertain the exact facts in the case. He keeps to the main question, he discusses no side issues; he does not undertake to demonstrate the authority, the inspiration, the "errancy" or "inerrancy" of the laws of Moses. He takes in hand the single question whether Moses *did write those books which bear his name*, or whether they are the spurious productions of unknown impostors in later generations. This question he examines from a purely literary point of view, and presents his conclusions in intelligible language for the acceptance of the common people. How well he has succeeded in his "Study," those who read must decide.

The author of this "Study" proposed in a second edition to correct some slight verbal inaccuracies which had been noticed; but his earthly labors are finished, and he is consequently unable to reply to his critics, or in any way improve the work which he had done. A few errata which he left behind him have been corrected in their places by the publisher, who has also carefully looked over a large collection of critiques and reviews which have appeared in the various papers,—most of them being heartily appreciative,—to see if they presented anything which required further attention.

One review, in the defunct *Index*, gives us in its opening sentence a sufficient intimation of the "sweet reasonableness" of its character, as follows:

"Dr. Stebbins has written a book which is the counterfeit presentment of his striking personality; a book that is loud and vehement, belligerent, bellicose, bursting with sacred rage."

The candid reader is thus advised as to what he will find within the pages of this book. He can read it for himself, and thus verify the statements of this writer. The main point which the *Index* makes is, that on pages 70 and 71 of this book "Every passage mentioned is beyond Ex. vi. 2, and it is the doctrine of Kuenen and all other scholars who accept the documentary theory, that beyond Ex. vi. 2 Jehovah is used almost exclusively." We give this remark for what it is worth, and quote another statement: "One of the most charming instances connected with the publication of Dr. Stebbins' volume, is the review of it by Prof. Toy, of the Cambridge Divinity School. . . Prof. Toy's review of Dr. Stebbins' study was an exquisite piece of work; it took off the Doctor's head so quietly that his mouth is talking still, in absolute unconsciousness of the Professor's deadly stroke."

So much for the *Index;* and now in the interests of perfect fairness, we take the liberty of reprinting what Prof. Toy had to say on the subject, as contained in the *Christian Register*, of December 15, 1881. As his criticism is endorsed by the *Index* as absolutely fatal to Dr. Stebbins, and as Prof. Toy has written an article which satisfied the critical instincts of the *Index*, without violating the decencies of civilized life, we are glad to give it place, that people may see what can be said by an able man, in brief space, on the other side of this question.

THE AGE OF THE PENTATEUCH.

BY PROF. C. H. TOY.

To the general reader, who looks only at the surface of the question, the opinions of scholars concerning the Pentateuch may seem to be in a chaotic state. One eminent critic pulls down what another has toiled to build up. As to the division of the text among the several Elohistic and Yahvistic authors or editors, and the dates of the several parts, different writers appear to be hopelessly at variance. The Egyptologists, the Assyriologists, the historical critics, and the grammarians seem to be pulling in opposite directions; and the unlearned reader is dazzled and confounded by mutually hostile arrays of facts, all drawn from the same source, but used by various investigators to establish various and sometimes mutually contradictory positions. Yet in this critical madness a method is discernible: it is evident that opinion among the great body of authorities has been steadily moving toward a late redaction of the Pentateuch. The earlier school of De Wette and Von Bohlen has passed away. Hupfeld, Ewald, and Bleek have been superseded; and later writers, representing different sides of the investigation,—Dillmann and Wellhausen, the literary-grammatical, Gramberg and Baudissin, the cultural, Kuenen and Oort, the evolutional, and Schrader and Friedrich Delitzsch, the Assyriological,—have entered into their labors, retained a certain part of their results, gathered new evidence, settled some points with greater precision, and essayed to lay the foundations of a science of Pentateuch criticism, not without differences among themselves (for disagreement is a necessary accompaniment of living research), but with an increasing clearness of perception that certain facts carry with them certain consequences. On the other hand, a different school of critics hold fast to the traditional view of the Pentateuch, for which they find new support in modern discoveries and investigations, on the basis of certain canons of interpretation. Out of the midst of the conflict of opinions, principles are emerging, whose value is not destroyed by the different interpretations that may be given to details.

No one will deny the desirableness of laying the principles and results of a science clearly before the mass of intelligent readers, who have not the time to go into the investigation for themselves. Dr. Stebbins has undertaken to do this in a sort for the Pentateuch question. He addresses himself not to scholars, but "to the sound sense and sober thought of the people."

But, instead of acting as teacher simply, he takes the position of advocate, and appeals to the people as judge. He asks them to compare his argument with their Bibles, and "exercise the same sound practical judgment respecting its validity that they exercise in the common affairs of life" (p. 3). Sound judgment, however, can be exercised only where there is acquaintance with the facts; and, with all respect for the intelligence of the people, they have not the requisite acquaintance with the facts. These facts, the acquisition of which costs years of study, cannot be given in one book, or mastered by a few hours reading. It would have been better, in my opinion, if Dr. Stebbins had either made an argument for scholars or given a simple exposition for those who are not specialists in this department. His book, as it stands, is too elementary for the former class, and too much crowded with detail for the latter. But this, if it be a fault, is a fault of construction, and does not effect the validity of his argument. He gives us here the results of his personal investigation, "extending over a period approaching half a century," in the form of an external and an internal argument for the early origin of the pentateuch, preceded by a criticism of Kuenen's "Religion of Israel." Clear, vigorous, sometimes trenchant in style, not abstaining from an occasional laugh at the follies of Kuenen and others, the book is interesting in itself, apart from the respect with which the opinion, of its esteemed author will be received.

In this argument, especially as addressed to the general public, it is very desirable that the main canons of criticism should be clearly stated; and it is to be regretted that our author has nowhere done this. When in our inquiry into the age of the Pentateuch, we come to look into its composition and into the evidence derived from other books, we find that its material is various, including bits of historical narration of very different character and import, and laws indicating very different degrees of religious and ecclesiastical development, and that the other books of the Old Testament contain references and allusions to men and things which appear also, though not always in the same shape, in the Pentateuch. We must carefully scrutinize these references to events and uses of words before we can determine how they bear on the question of the age of our Pentateuch. Suppose, for example, that a popular custom is mentioned in Ruth (4: 8) as existing several generations before David's time, and that something like it (though the two in this case are by no means identical) is found in Deuteronomy (25: 9): this does not prove that the book of Deuteronomy was composed in those early times, it need show nothing more than that the author of the book introduced this old custon into his code; and, if there be other considerations pointing to a late origin for Deuteronomy, the presence of such laws will not stand in the way of the conclusion. Or, if the prophet Hosea (chapter 12) shows acquaintance with the history of Jacob, this does not authorize us to infer that he had our book of Genesis before him: there may have been in existence in his day some brief compendium of the lives of the three patriarchs, or he may have quoted simply from the oral tradition; and, if other considerations lead us to assign a post-exilian date to Genesis, these references to Jacob will present no difficulty for such date. That the pre-exilian prophets and other writers speak of sacrifices, feasts,

and other religious observances mentioned in the Pentateuch has nothing to do with the date of composition of our books of Leviticus and Numbers. No one doubts that such things existed from very early times, and that regulations concerning them may have been early committed to writing. The question is, whether there are not in these middle books of the Pentateuch some laws that are not referred to before the exile, and are not explicable by the pre-exilian history. No word is more misleading in this respect than the common term tora, translated "law" in the common version. Its proper meaning is "instruction," and it occurs abundantly in the prophets in this general, untechnical sense. For example, the prophet Isaiah (8: 16, 20) uses it of an exhortation or instruction on a particular point which he has himself given a few verses before; and its occurrence, in this simple shape, is no proof of the existence of any definite code, much less of that which is contained in our present Pentateuch.

Confronted by these simple canons, the greater part of Dr. Stebbins' external argument for the antiquity of the Pentateuch, as it appears to me, falls away. It is true, as he says, that sacrifices and feasts and other old usages are mentioned in the prophets and in historical narrations as connected with early times, that the word "law" occurs frequently before the exile, and that during and after the reign of Josiah the expression "law of Moses" comes into use; but these facts are consistent with the view that there existed from an early period a body of usages which were traditionally referred to Moses, and that this body of common law, constantly changing its character by growth and decay, was put into shape by a prophetic writer in the reign of Josiah (smaller collections of laws having perhaps before this been committed to writing), and afterwards enlarged and systematized by other prophetic and priestly men. This external argument, therefore, fails to establish other existence of our Pentateuch before the exile.

The same defect inheres in the internal argument, so far as it is based on indisputable facts. It does not prove what is claimed. It is undoubtedly true that there is minuteness of detail in the Pentateuch (as in the description of the Tabernacle), that various laws are said to have sprung from definite historical occasions, that there are frequent references to the wilderness, and that along with many discrepancies there is a general concinnity in the structure of the book. But to affirm that these facts establish its wilderness origin is to deny that later Hebrew writers were capable of elaborating a connected and tolerably consistent narrative from a mass of traditions, usages, laws, and narrations that may have come down from remote times, gathering volume and acquiring shape with each generation. Such an elaboration is, however, not only conceivable, but quite in keeping with Oriental ideas and practice; and it presupposes neither mental blindness nor moral depravity. A pious man of Josiah's time, feeling deeply certain wants of his people, might, without offence to his sense of truth and honesty, gather up the best existing laws which in his opinion rested on a Mosaic basis, and send them forth under the name of Moses, prefaced by a hortatory discourse put into the mouth of the great lawgiver; and pious priests and scribes during and after the exile might, with equal conviction of right, still further combine and arrange and interweave into the history

succeeding laws and usages, which, believing them to proceed from the God of Israel, they would without hesitation refer to the man whom the accepted tradition regarded as God's instrument for revealing to his people all that was necessary for their national religious life. There would be no obtuseness or dishonesty in all this. These writers were not modern critical historians: they were simply pious Jews, who could not doubt that what they believed to be the divine law had been given by Moses, just as the pious, learned, acute Jews of the Talmudic period believed without dishonesty that the Man of the Great Synagogue wrote the book of Daniel, and a later generation held that Ezra had introduced the square Hebrew consonants and the vowel points, though the latter had come in almost under their noses.

The correctness of the representation of Egyptian matters in the Pentateuch is undeniable. Ebers, for example, has illustrated this in a very striking manner. The proper inference from this is that the Egyptian narratives in Genesis and Exodus rest on correct tradition or observation, not that they were written by Joseph and the ancestors of Moses; and still more decidedly not that the books of Genesis and Exodus were composed at that time. If the ark and the urim and thummim are of Egyptian origin, this may show that the Israelites once dwelt in Egypt, but it gives no testimony to the date of our Pentateuchal books.

There is, finally, the argument from language, the alleged antiquity of style of the Pentateuch. Here, again, it is necessary to move cautiously, both in stating the facts and in drawing conclusions from them. The list of words peculiar to the Pentateuch cannot be said to be evidence of date, for it is now commonly held that their presence is due to the fact that in the later verbal recensions the Tora, or Law, was dealt with sparingly by reason of the greater sacredness that attached to it. Other books, which may have been equally old, were revised, and this was left almost untouched. Then there is no grammatical-literary objection to putting Deuteronomy in the seventh century B. C., or to assigning most of the legal parts of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers to the period of the exile. As to the remaining portions, it is difficult to discover any important differences of style between Genesis and Exodus on the one hand and Judges and Samuel on the other; and these last may be assumed to have been composed during the exile. That there are earlier fragments in the historical books and the Pentateuch, few critics will be disposed to deny; but there is nothing in the language calling on us to date any of them earlier than the days of the writing prophets. Dr. Stebbins pertinently points out that the style of the Tora is free from Aramaisms, and that the text therefore belongs to the pre-Aramaic period,—that is, it is almost certainly not later than the fifth century B. C. Farther than this, it is difficult for the purely linguistic argument to go.

I believe I have stated the main grounds on which the work under review rests its defence of the antiquity of the Pentateuch, not with the purpose of discussing the general question, but simply to test the validity of these grounds; to ask whether our author's very interesting and instructive grouping of the facts carries with it the conclusion that he draws, or

whether some other supposition may not equally well explain the phenomena. The space does not allow an examination of his criticism of Kuenen's book; but his remarks are based on the same principles that he announces in his main argument, and stand or fall with them. The real question at issue is the propriety of the historical method employed by Kuenen and others, not the correctness of their particular results. Dr. Stebbins thinks this method essentially vicious, and proposes one of his own, which, though it is skillfully defended, seems to me not to be satisfactory.

To this courteous critique, Dr. Stebbins, in the succeeding number of the *Register*, briefly replied as follows:

"I have no desire to enter into any criticism of Prof. Toy's notice of my little book. . . Only one passage demands notice. Prof. Toy says:

'The real question at issue is the propriety of the historical method employed by Kuenen and others, not the correctness of their particular results. Dr. Stebbins thinks this method essentially vicious, and proposes one of his own, which, though it is skillfully defended, seems to me not satisfactory.'

"This is not an exact statement of the case, if I correctly understand the passage. I deny that Dr. Kuenen's method *is* historical, and show by a quotation from him that his whole 'method' is based upon 'a *supposition* with respect to the Mosaic period' and 'our (his) conception of historical development.' See 'Study,' pp. 14, 15, 16. If the history does not conform to these, it is wrong: if it does, it is right. This, I said, was *not* the historical method, but a purely empirical method. On the other hand, I 'assumed' nothing, I 'supposed' nothing. I had no hypothesis of 'human progress' to which all ancient records must be conformed. I laid down a canon of historical criticism to which all historical enquiries must conform to result in truth. It may be found on page eighty-three of my book:

'*If we find that an ancient book is referred to, in all later works, by the name which is now given to it, and that references are made to it, and that quotations are made from its contents, such substantially as we now find in it, then the proper, the necessary conclusion is that the book is the same as that which we possess.*'

"Yet Prof. Toy regrets that I have not 'clearly stated the main canons of criticism.' That canon I scrupulously regarded; and, by regarding it, the conclusion was reached that 'the Pentateuch is substantially of the Mosaic age, and largely, either directly or indirectly, of Mosaic origin.' Till this 'canon of historical criticism' is proved incorrect, or my adherence to it imperfect, this 'conclusion will stand unshaken. RUFUS P. STEBBINS."

The conclusions reached by some of the Higher Critics may be expressed in the words of Dr. Toy in his tract on "Modern Biblical Criticism" (pp. 9–11) where, referring to the account of "the complete conquest of the land under Joshua," contained in the books of Joshua and Judges, he says:

"This story, which violates all historical probability, must be rejected; the march from Egypt through the wilderness, and the exploits of Moses and Joshua must be regarded as a mass of legend, whose kernel of history, if there be any, we are not able to extract. This reasoning applies with still greater force to the stories of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph, in Genesis. The ancestors of Ehud, Gideon, and Jepthah could not have led such lives. These biographies are beautiful legends, with here and there vague reminiscences of events of the time of the judges and later. . . . The first great Law-book, Deuteronomy, appears under Josiah. . . . During the exile Ezekiel and others develop the ritual; . . . a century or two later the Levitical law (as we have it in Leviticus and Numbers) is introduced into Palestine by Ezra. . . The book of Chronicles, written several centuries after the exile, . . . makes David and his successors acquainted with the whole law of Moses, and must be looked on as untrustworthy in its accounts of Religion."

"Historical probability" is one thing, historical truth is another. Inventors of falsehoods take pains to make them as probable as they can. Improbable things often happen, and truth is often more strange than fiction. Fifty years ago, in the middle of the nineteenth century, you could buy a man in Fiji for seven dollars, and slaughter him and eat him. It would "violate all historical probability" to believe that *now* you could not purchase a man there at any price, and that under the light of the Bible nearly every house in those islands has become a place for God's worship, and more than nine-tenths of the people may be found on the Lord's day peaceably assembled to hear the Word of God and worship the Most High.

Twenty centuries hence, when the Higher Critics of to-day are classified with the *Dodo*, the *Megatherium*, and other extinct species, another race of observers, explorers, and investigators may arise, who will scout the tales of the nineteenth century cannibalism and conversion, as "a violation of all historical probabillity," pronounce the biographies of Judson and Livingstone and Paton mythical legends; and reasoning from the historic accounts of the opium trade in China, the rum traffic in Africa, and other enterprises engaged in by "Christian nations" such as England, Germany, France, and America, will, on critical grounds, conclude that the New Testament was an unknown book at the close of the nineteenth century, and that the Sermon on the Mount was never preached at all.

There are historical probabilities concerning the future as well as the past. It is a poor rule that will not work both ways; and it will be hard to find anything in the stories of the Judges which is a greater violation of "historical probability" than the locomotive, the steam-ship, the telegraph, the telephone, the electric light, the electric motor, and a hundred other things, which would have

been spurned as day-dreams a century ago, but which now stand before us as undeniable facts. It is the unexpected that happens, and it is the unexpected which is thought worthy of record. The improbabilities and impossibilities of a century ago are the prosaic and common-place facts of to-day. The question is not "What is probable?" but "What is *true?*" Dr. Stebbins has some words upon this point well worthy our attention.

"As an illustration of the danger of rejecting as authentic history remarkable occurrences and marvelous statements of numbers, I will call the reader's attention to the following fact respecting the class presenting themselves for entering Harvard College, 1881. Two hundred and forty young men presented themselves, of whom one hundred and fifty-four were admitted, and eighty-six rejected. These men were numbered from 1 to 240, of these the *first* 5, with one exception, in *every* 20 were rejected. Thus 1–5, inclusive, 21–25, inclusive, 41–45, 61–65, 81–85, 101–105, 121–125, 141–145, 161–165, 181–185, 201–205, 221–225. Now, the chance that this would happen, or *a priori* be sure, is as one to infinity, or as one to a row of figures around the earth. It looks like a carefully arranged plot.

"But this is not all. All the number 9's in the even 10's (as 29, 49, 69, 89, etc.) to 149 were rejected, while all the number 9's in the odd 10's (as 9, 19, 39, 59, etc.) to 159 were admitted, and also all numbers above 159 having 9 for the last figure, as 169, 179, 189, 199, etc. That such should be the result of the examination of 240 persons seems incredible. The statement would be instantly rejected by many critics if found in the Hebrew books. Indeed, things not half as improbable would be scouted.

"A remarkable corespondence of years is found in the ages and time of service of the presidents of the United States. Jefferson was born eight years after John Adams, and Madison eight years after Jefferson, and Monroe eight years after Madison, and John Quincy Adams eight years after Monroe. This is curious enough, and antecedently to proof incredible enough; but there is something to render it more incredible. John Adams, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe were each sixty-six years old when they retired from the presidency. Nor is this all. The first three died on the 4th of July, and two of the three died on the same 4th, and these two were signers of the Declaration of Independence. Now the improbability of such a coincidence is as one to millions of millions. Yet it is true that it did take place. It will not do to be hasty in denying the occurrence of very strange things."

Those who seek to eliminate the supernatural from the Bible, have yet to face the fact that "wonders" and "wonderful works" are the special characteristics of the God of Israel. He showed "signs and wonders upon Pharaoh." Neh. ix. 10. "His wonders" were to be declared "among all people." Ps. xcvi. 3. "Many, O Lord my God, are thy wonderful works." Ps. xl. 5. "He hath made his wonderful works to be remembered." Ps. cxi. 4.

The world around us is full of marvels. We are fearfully and wonderfully made. The microscope and telescope are constantly revealing wonders that are almost beyond belief. He who wrought wonders of old is working wonders still. "He that will watch for providences will never lack providences to watch." God liveth yet, and he hears, and answers, and delivers, and helps his people. Doubters may doubt, despisers may "wonder and perish;" but they that are of faith are still "blessed with faithful Abraham," and "the people that do know their God, shall be strong and do exploits."

A book which contained no knowledge "too wonderful" for an ignorant and short-sighted man, and which recorded no events but the commonplace occurrences of ordinary life, would have little claim to our regard as a divine revelation, and indeed little reason for its own existence. A book from God must be a book of "depths, both of wisdom and knowledge;" and a book which records His works, must have judgments which are "unsearchable" and "ways past finding out." Rom. xi. 33. And, as a musical composition, recording harmonies which angels might bend to hear, would convey no sound or thought to an unmusical eye and ear; as a mathematical treatise which measured the universe would be but a bewildering mass of senseless figures to the untaught reader; as the most eloquent words ever penned would be utterly meaningless to one who looked upon them written in an unknown tongue;—so a divine book, a record of the wondrous works of an almighty God, inspired by his Spirit, and filled with his wisdom, would naturally be as unintelligible to the "wise and prudent," whose wisdom is only "earthly, sensual and devilish," as a page of Sanscrit would be to a country clod-hopper, or a treatise on the higher mathematics to a savage who could not count ten. There must be a "preparation of the heart" which "is from the Lord," before we can "know the things that are freely given to us of God." We must take Christ's yoke upon us; and as we learn of him who is "meek and lowly of heart," and find rest to our souls, we shall see that one step in wisdom's ways prepares for another, and shall be better fitted to explore those "treasures of wisdom and knowledge" which are hid in Him "in whom dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." "The world by wisdom knew not God." There are ranges of truth which the intellect of the "natural man" or "*soulual* man," (1 Cor. ii. 14, 15), fails to grasp. "The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. He taketh the wise in their own craftiness." 1 Cor. iii. 19.

A judicious writer has remarked: "It is a common mistake with men of no real piety, to suppose that what they know of other

subjects qualifies them to judge properly of religion; but religion is a subject *sui generis*, and requires not only the exercise of reason, but the possession of its own organ; and this only God can give, and he will give to every one who rightly seeks it. 'The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God . . neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. But he that is *spiritual* judgeth all things.'" 1 Cor. ii. 14, 15. This principle when understood may explain much of the contradictory and discordant criticism of the day. It does not help a blind man to give him more light: what he needs is *sight*. The apostle's first errand to the Gentiles was "to *open their eyes;*" then he was "to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God." Acts xxvi. 18. Intellectual greatness does not insure the knowledge of God. Egypt built pyramids and worshiped *cats!* Many a man, wise with the world's learning, needs to be taught that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom;" and to "receive the kingdom of God as a little child."

As Dr. Leonard Staehlin declared before the Leipsic Pastoral Conference: "It is a righteous Nemesis that the Old Testament conceals its content in the presence of a treatment to which, for a time, it has been subjected. There is in the Old Testament a certain something which cannot be reached by the hammer, the lever, the crow-bar, which have been used around the building. Remarked Oettinger once, 'God has so ordered his Word that the learned do not get behind it.' And when people try to resolve the revelation of God, contained in the Old Testament, into common history, the peculiarity of its contents remains untouched, and the method followed in the matter can have no authority as a historical method, for which it gives itself out, for, by this method, in the place of really miraculous events, are but the supposed events of ordinary history, of which absolutely nothing is known, because the sources are wanting. In opposition to all such clamorings stands the Old Testament, in its holy, quiet heights, like the God whom it declares, surrounded by darkness, enveloped in clouds, but out of which, like lightning, the whole majesty of the divine revelation breaks forth."

In conclusion, let it be remembered that the questions involved in this discussion are momentous. If God has spoken in these books we should know it; if he has not thus spoken we should not be deceived. May He who is the Way the Truth and the Life, open our understandings, that we may understand the Scriptures, and grant to us the Holy Spirit to guide us into all truth.

H. L. HASTINGS.

Boston, Mass., U. S. A.,
April, 1895.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

PREFACE.

This work is substantially a reprint of a series of articles published in the years 1879 and 1880. I have not found it necessary to essentially modify any of the arguments there presented in the present publication. Several works and many articles, at home and abroad, have since been published; but they do not in the slightest degree affect the force of the argument presented in the following "Study."

It seemed better to give the criticism on the Dutch School as represented by Dr. Kuenen as originally written than to attempt by partial rewriting and voluminous notes to introduce the substance of it into the body of the work. In this manner, the argument of the "Study" is not interrupted by noticing the objections and answering the arguments and criticising the evidence which are offered by many writers as well as by Dr. Kuenen. Professor W. Robertson Smith's lectures on the *Old Testament and the Jewish Church* were not published till this work was more than half through the press. I have examined it with care, and find very little which would have required any notice, had I received it in season. Though he takes substantially the same ground on many points as the Dutch school, he denies that Deuteronomy is a forgery of the priests of the time of Josiah, and that the Books of the Chronicles are historical forgeries to sustain the new claims of the priesthood. The three principal reasons which he gives for the late origin of the Pentateuch, especially the ritual portion of it, are: first, the neglect of observing the law, and direct violations of it, down to the division of the kingdom or later; second, a distinct priestly family or caste did not exist till the time of

Ezra; and, third, the early prophets, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah, refer to no written law, and denounce ritual observances. I have examined with care whether the evidence adduced to sustain these reasons is sufficient to justify the author's opinion, and do not find it necessary to add but few special notes to the body of this work, in order to show that it fails to confirm the theory of the late origin of the Pentateuch. The "Introductory on Dr. Kuenen's *Religion of Israel*" examines the validity of these reasons as presented by the Dutch school, and I do not wish to enlarge this work by a mere repetition of the argument in another form and in other words. The same may be said of the special arguments of Graf and several other writers.

This work is not addressed to scholars, but is an appeal to the sound sense and sober thought of the people. It has been published at the request, however, of scholars, professors in theological schools, and ministers of different denominations, for their own use and for the use of their classes and parishes. I have not, therefore, filled the bottom of the page with references, as it would have been very easy to have done; for they would have been utterly useless to the great body of the people, for whose instruction I send forth this book. Let my readers take their Bibles and compare my argument in this "Study," as they read it, with the sacred narrative, and exercise the sound, practical judgment respecting its validity which they exercise in the common affairs of life, and I have no fear of the result. May the Source of all Truth bless this endeavor to find and proclaim it!

RUFUS P. STEBBINS.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTORY ON "KUENEN'S RELIGION OF ISRAEL," 7

A STUDY OF THE PENTATEUCH.

I. INTRODUCTION, ... 75

II. EXTERNAL EVIDENCES, ... 82

III. INTERNAL EVIDENCES, ... 157

ANALYTICAL INDEX, ... 231

INTRODUCTORY

ON

DR. KUENEN'S "RELIGION OF ISRAEL."*

OF the brilliant constellation of Dutch Biblical critics which has just risen above the horizon, Dr. Kuenen appears to be the principal star. His works on *The Religion of Israel* and *The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel* are by far the most extensive and elaborate of any works of this new and able school of writers. The eyes of scholars are now turned from Germany to Holland; and the wonder of some and the admiration of others are challenged to the utmost. Condemnation and laudation will be visited upon these authors in unstinted measure; for they give no quarter to dissentients, and will, therefore, receive none from them. They write in a tone of perfect self-reliance, and hold in low estimate any opinions not corresponding with theirs. The infallibility of the late Pio Nono was modesty compared with the dogmatic certainty with which they make affirmations upon subjects about

* *The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State.* By Dr. A. Kuenen, Professor of Theology at the University of Leyden. Translated from the Dutch by Alfred Heath May. Vol. I., pp. ix., 412. 1874. Vol. II., pp. 307. 1875. Vol. III., pp. 345. 1875. 8vo. Williams & Norgate, 14 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London, and 20 South Frederick Street, Edinburgh.

which such scholars as Gesenius, Ewald, De Wette, to say nothing of others hardly their inferiors, hesitated to give an opinion, much less to dogmatize. The emphatic manner in which they announce as finalities some of the flimsiest of their speculations and hypotheses provokes a smile.* There will be ample and frequent opportunity to illustrate this signal characteristic of the work under review in the course of this essay.

The style of this work of Dr. Kuenen's is as dry as it is dogmatic. We are informed, by those competent to judge, that the translator has done no injustice to the original. It is true that freshness and raciness are not to be expected as the prime qualities of a work of this kind; yet it ought to be exempt from jejuneness, and to be animated and warm with the dignity and importance of the subject. It should surely kindle some enthusiasm to trace the history of a people like the Jews, and describe a literature which includes such writings as the Book of Job, the Psalms, and the prophecies of Isaiah and Amos and Joel and Hosea. It is true that Dr. Kuenen is not writing a history of the literature of Israel, and may not have felt any of the admiration which an appreciative reader of these marvellous productions cannot suppress, as he feels the glow and heart-throb in every syllable of the ancient poet. His eye was fixed almost exclusively on "altars" and "asheras" and "bull-gods," and "chiuns" and "chemoshes" and "Molochs" and "Levites" and "priests" and the "ritual" that was not before Ezekiel "certainly," not before Ezra "probably." Dr. Kuenen's theme was the "religion," not

* See Appendix A, p. 59.

the literature, of Israel, and he is not to be blamed but praised for adhering to it. If it was a dry subject, it was not his fault. He is responsible only for its treatment. To an examination of this, we will now address ourselves.

Dr. Kuenen, in the three octavo volumes before us, treats of the development of the "Religion of Israel" from the earliest period down "to the fall of the Jewish State." He does not fail of doing justice to the theme for want of space. Three octavo volumes, including over one thousand closely-printed pages, cannot be judged a cramped or an abbreviated discussion of the subject. As far as quantity is concerned, there is no ground for fault-finding. What, then, is the *quality* of the work done by the author?

With an honorable frankness, at the very start Dr. Kuenen states his "stand-point," his "sources of information," and "the plan and division" of his history. "Our stand-point," he says, "is sketched in a single stroke, as it were, by the manner in which this work sees the light. It does not stand entirely alone, but is one of a number of monographs on 'the principal religions.' For us, the Israelitish is one of these religions, nothing less, but also nothing more." These religions may differ from each other in value, but one is no more a special revelation from God than another. Christianity belongs in the same category. All religions claim to be revelations from God, and the claims of all are equally delusive. This is the author's "stand-point," from which he views and discusses the "religion of Israel."* It is not our purpose to chal-

* Vol. I., pp. 5-12, 27.

lenge its justness, at least not in this stage of the discussion.

The author's "sources of information" are "the entire literature of Israel, so far as it originated in the period" of which he treats. The value of each writer's opinion and testimony must be determined by the age in which he lived and the authorities which he used. Hence "it is of the highest importance to trace out and determine, first of all, the age of the various books and of their several constituent parts,— for instance, of the different prophets and psalms." But the authors of the historical books of the Old Testament, from Genesis to Esther, were not contemporaries with the events which they record; and, therefore, we cannot receive their account of the origin and development of their religion, *unless it agrees with the laws of human progress*, as understood by the author. These histories also contain narratives of incredible events, miracles,—such as the passage of the Red Sea and the Jordan, the manna, the wandering in the wilderness, the giving of the law at Sinai. All these events are simply impossible, and are therefore incredible. Hence, we discover that these writers "fearlessly allowed themselves to be guided in their statements by the wants of the present and the requirements of the future. They considered themselves exempt from all responsibility." The priests and the prophets took opposite views, and perverted history to sustain their respective opinions. The narrative of the same transaction in the Books of the Kings differs widely from that given in the Books of the Chronicles. In these latter and later books, the priests colored or invented

the history to suit their ends, without regard to truth.*

We give an illustration referred to by Dr. Kuenen as a type of the style of these falsifying historians: "If any one wishes to form an idea of the modifications which the materials supplied by *tradition* underwent upon being worked up afresh, let him compare together II. Kings xi., and II. Chronicles xxii., 10;—xxiii., 21. If the chronicler, under the influence of his sympathy for priests and Levites, could give such an *entirely different version* of the elevation of Joash to the throne of his fathers, which was related with perfect clearness in the older account, with which he was well acquainted, how much more likely" was it that earlier writers should handle the more ancient narratives in a manner to answer their *priestly* ends. (The italics are ours.)

Such is the statement of Dr. Kuenen's chosen illustration of the partisan bias of the chronicler, and its influence on his work. Let us examine its value and by it judge the value of all such accusations.

I. Dr. Kuenen says his "materials were supplied by *tradition*." The chronicler says that these things and more "are *written* in the story of the Book of the Kings," xxiv., 27; and the historian of the reign of Joash, in II. Kings xi., xii., says that "the rest of the acts of Joash and all that he did are *written* . . . in the Book of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah." Both writers relied upon written documents and *not* upon "tradition." Comment is unnecessary.

II. Dr. Kuenen assumes that the chronicler had before him no written documents except our Book of Kings, and that he "worked up" the facts there re-

*Vol. I., pp. 8–22, 24.

corded as he pleased. The work which he refers to here and in other places is apparently a very different one from our Book of Kings, and was undoubtedly the public records which had been saved during the captivity. But how could Dr. Kuenen say that his "materials were supplied by tradition," when he was perfectly "well acquainted" with the "older account" in Kings, which he had "worked up" to suit his priestly ends?

III. Dr. Kuenen accuses the writer of falsifying history to sustain the priestly pretensions, not to say usurpations, of his age, for two reasons: one, because he is fuller in his account of the action of the priests during the reign of Joash, and the other, apparently, because, if the chronicler's narrative is substantially correct, his, Dr. Kuenen's, theory of the development of the religion of Israel is false. We have nothing to say about the latter reason. Of the former, we say that the writer of the Kings may be in error. But there is no reason to suppose that both writers are not substantially correct. There is no direct contradiction between them. Applying the common rule of criticism, that "what one does by another he does himself," there is no appearance of contradiction in their accounts. Jehoiada, the high-priest, and the priests, are represented in Kings as being very active in both civil and religious affairs. The special services which they rendered in both are more fully narrated by the chronicler; but there is not a shadow of evidence that he was laboring under such an ecclesiastical bias as to lead him to falsify history, that he might exalt the priesthood to honor. On the contrary, he relates, without rebuke, how, in the great reformation under Hezekiah, II. Chronicles xxix., 34,

when "the priests were too few, so that they could not flay all the burnt offerings, their brethren, the Levites, did help them till the work was ended, and until the other priests had sanctified themselves; *for the Levites were more upright in heart to sanctify themselves than the priests.*" A writer whose purpose was to elevate the priesthood above the Levites would not have thus written. See also xxx., 15, 17; xxxv., 10–15.

IV. Dr. Kuenen says the chronicler gives "an entirely different version of the elevation of Joash to the throne" from the writer of Kings. Let us note the facts: Jehosheba "took Joash and hid him and his nurse in the bed-chamber from Athaliah, so that he was not slain" in the massacre of the rest of the family; so also the chronicler states. He was hid six years; so the chronicler. And in the seventh year Jehoiada gathered the rulers over hundreds and other officers into the house of the Lord, where they took an oath and made a covenant, and showed them the king's son and crowned him, stationing a guard in different parts of the city and temple; the chronicler only adds that in the temple as guards none but priests and Levites entered. When Athaliah learned what was done, and cried "Treason!" she was slain; so the chronicler. And Jehoiada took the king to the king's house, and sat him on the throne of the kingdom: the same in Chronicles, save that Jehoiada arraigned also the priests, that the services of the temple might be renewed, as it is "written in the law of Moses." Are these "*entirely* different versions of the elevation of Joash to the throne of his fathers"? We submit that it would be difficult to find two accounts of the

coronation of Queen Victoria more alike. We are curious to know what accounts Dr. Kuenen would call similar if these are "*entirely different.*" *

But it is time to return from specific criticism to a consideration of the main course of argument in the work before us; were we to yield to the temptation offered, we should write a volume.

Such being "the condition of the sources of our information," Dr. Kuenen may well ask, "How are we to endeavor to arrive at historical truth" respecting the religion of the people?

The answer to this question discloses the "*plan*" of the author. It is as follows: —

"We offer, for instance, a supposition with respect to the Mosaic period. On the strength of various indications, we assume that the people of Israel and the man who delivered them out of their bondage in Egypt had reached such and such a degree of religious development. We proceed with our investigation, and gradually come to the centuries during which the narratives about Moses and his work were written down. We now succeed in showing that, *if our conception of the course of historical development be the true one*, the representation given in these narratives must *necessarily have been formed at that time*, and could have assumed no other shape."†

This is frank and intelligible. The author informs us that he "*assumes*" as an historical verity a certain state of "religious development," and then affirms that if, according to *his* theory of the evolution of ideas and human progress, the condition of the people, five or ten

* Vol. I., pp. 12–27. † Vol. I., pp. 26–32.

centuries later, conforms to the demands of the theory, the "assumed" state of things was correct, and the representation of those early ages given in the historical books must have been merely the *mistaken conception of the writers;* and proves that all narratives containing such representations of opinions must have been written at a later period, since no such opinions, according to his theory of development, could have been entertained by the men of the Mosaic age, nor long subsequent to it. In short, Dr. Kuenen has a theory respecting what could, and could not, have been believed and done in the Mosaic and following age; *and since the historical books do not sustain that theory, they are not ancient, they are not reliable;* the writers have attributed opinions, laws, customs of their own times to the time of their great ancestor. It does not appear to have occurred to Dr. Kuenen that his theory may be wrong, and that the old histories may be substantially correct. Now if his theory, or assumption, or "supposition" is without solid foundation in reason and undoubted facts, then the whole elaborate structure of his work,—

> "Like the baseless fabric of a vision,
> . . . shall dissolve,
> And leave not a rack behind."

Such is the "*plan*," the theory, which is to determine the age and value of the Old Testament books and the opinions which were prevalent among the Israelites in the time of Moses, and in all subsequent times:—if a book contains opinions and describes customs and alludes to religious rites, which, *according to Dr. Kuenen's*

theory, could not have been developed and prevalent at so early a period, then the writer, unwittingly or maliciously, states what is false; for all historical truth or falsehood is to be tested by this theory. It is the Procrustean bed on which all statements are to be fitted, however great the compression or extension.

Where, then, does the author think he finds solid ground on which he may stand, and whence he can take his departure and apply his theory of historical verity? As there is almost no historical literature extant which was composed before the captivity, 588 B.C., the writings of the early prophets are examined to learn the condition of religion and religious customs in Israel, 808–700 B.C. Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Zechariah, Micah, and Nahum are accepted as authority, and quoted to show what opinions were prevalent, and what rites were customary in the eighth century before Christ, the fifth or sixth century after Moses. Dr. Kuenen does not omit the prophet Joel on any theoretical grounds, but because some writers place him in a later period. There is no valid reason, however, why the writings of Joel, as well as those of the other prophets named, should not be considered as good authority for the religious condition of this period.

In order to understand the bearing of these quotations on Dr. Kuenen's theory, it is necessary now to state, in as intelligible a manner as brevity will admit, the order of the evolution of religious ideas, as *assumed* in this theory among men, and especially among the ancestors of the Israelites, and among the Israelites themselves. The first religious state is fetichism, pre-Abrahamic; then polytheism, sub-Abrahamic, down to

the return from the captivity; then monotheism. A few men were monotheists so far as Israel was concerned. This people had but one God. They believed, however, there were other gods for other nations, and no more doubted their existence than they doubted the existence of Jahveh. Moses was one of these, and others succeeded him; but they were few who believed in but one God for Israel. The idea of God became purer, however, as generations passed away, till, in the eighth century, in the time of Amos, very much more worthy and nobler views were entertained of the nature and character of the Supreme Being, and worthier and purer worship was demanded. The sacrifices of beasts and fruits were remanded to a secondary place, and human sacrifices were pronounced abhorrent to God. Moses wrote nothing of the Pentateuch but an abbreviated form of the Ten Commandments or "Ten Words." A few chapters in Exodus and Leviticus may have been composed before settling in Canaan; but the Book of Deuteronomy was not composed till the reign of Josiah, 620 B.C., and the historical portions of the four other books were not written till the captivity. Ezra and his fellow-priests drew up nearly the whole ritual as we now find it in Leviticus and the other books of the Pentateuch just before his return to Jerusalem from Babylon, and brought it with him, and introduced it, with the aid of Nehemiah and the priests, as a Mosaic production, and venerable with age and the observance of the fathers; and the Books of Chronicles were written, perverting and falsifying history, to sustain the false claim of Ezra's ritual to antiquity and the supremacy of the tribe of Levi, and the

dignity and sacredness of the priesthood. The older historian of the Books of the Kings had no knowledge of any such ritual and priesthood. The prophets disappeared before the new order of priests, and the voice of the poet-preacher was stifled by the smoke of holocausts.

In due time, after centuries of struggle, suffering, despair, and hope, the great Teacher came and announced a spiritual worship, demanding no sacrifice but a devout heart, no temple but a consecrated spirit; and Judaism blossomed into Christianity, and the religion of Israel was transformed into the religion of the world. Such is substantially Dr. Kuenen's theory of the development of religious ideas in Israel, and the origin of the books of the Old Testament. We are confident that we have not omitted any important particular or element of it.

We now return to an examination of Dr. Kuenen's method of laying the foundation of his proof of this theory or hypothesis in the writings of the prophets, named on a previous page, who wrote during the eighth century before Christ, or five or six centuries after the putative time of Moses. And now let it be most distinctly understood that the historical books are ruled out of this discussion for the present by Dr. Kuenen's own decision of their modern date and careless or unscrupulous writers. He must not refer to them when they record something which corresponds with his theory, and ignore them or challenge them when they record something which opposes his theory. No doubt he intends to hold the scales evenly balanced, but he is sometimes tempted beyond what he is able to bear

to appeal as authority to the very witness he has pronounced not trustworthy. Examples of this weakness would be given were it necessary for our purpose, but our space is all of it to the last letter demanded for our special object, namely, to show *the radical defect and failure* of Dr. Kuenen's supposed proof of his theory respecting the origin of these books, and hence of the origin and development of the "Religion of Israel."

In the very brief writings of these prophets, "monotheism" is most emphatically taught, and the sin of worshipping idols and serving the gods of other nations is most emphatically rebuked; and the severest calamities are threatened if they forsake "the law of" Jehovah; and "captivity" as well as "drouth" and "locusts" are predicted as the portion of the nation, if the people obey not God, and do not observe his "commandments." The temple was in existence, sacrifices were offered, feasts were kept, "priests" served at the altar, and "the law" was often appealed to as a rule of duty. In these brief fragments of the poetic addresses of the prophets, we have allusions to all the main features of the ritual service as described in Chronicles and Ezra. The sternness of the rebukes of these prophets, when they saw the wickedness of the people in making and worshipping idols, is not strange; is far from being "a remarkable phenomenon," even when producing open "conflict" and persecution. What may be done and said without opposition in Holland now we do not know; but what was done to free speakers and writers centuries ago we know well enough; and we know that in later times Fox and Wesley and Whitefield were persecuted as

bitterly as those prophets of 800 B.C., to say nothing of Rogers and Cranmer, the martyrs of bloody Mary, and the victims of the merciless Jeffries, cruelly tortured in the blasphemed name of religion. There are no "causes" far to seek, or hard to understand, as Dr. Kuenen supposes, why these prophets were assailed by the law-breakers, the cruel, the false, the idol-worshippers, and idol-makers. The "conflict" is as old as time, and will continue till time shall be no longer. Yet our author infers — nay, affirms — that this "conflict" and persecution could not have arisen if the Pentateuch had existed.

One would suppose that Dr. Kuenen would now examine with closest scrutiny these statements, so clear and explicit, and their bearing upon his theory, which these writers, whose veracity he does not question, furnish so abundantly. He does no such thing. He hastens to inquire into "the earlier fortune of the people of Israel," as if he perceived that these prophets furnished his theory no support. But what materials has he, on his own theory, to furnish him any information about it? Not a line of history was written, as he affirms, till this period, or later; and what was written then was "not historical." The writers of most of these historical books, called so only by way of courtesy, lived, on the theory of Dr. Kuenen, after these prophets, and "considered themselves exempt from all responsibility" as to the truth of the events which they narrate. If there is no reliable record of events previous to 800 B.C., we are very much at a loss to guess where he gets his information. If he writes from his "inner consciousness" only, his history has no more

reliable source than that of those old Jewish writers whom he so soundly berates for their groundless stories. If the Books of the Kings and of Samuel are not reliable accounts, how can he quote them as he does to show the state, civil and religious, of the people "earlier" than the eighth century? We stand firmly here. Dr. Kuenen must either reject or accept these historical books as being substantially reliable. If he accepts them, then the controversy is ended, and his emphatic condemnation of the untrustworthiness of their writers is a gross injustice. If he rejects them, then he has no right to appeal to them as authority in any case whatever. He can take which horn of the dilemma he chooses. He cannot be permitted to select here and there a story, cull out here and there a sentence, because it answers the purposes of his theory and confirms his "assumption," and reject all the rest.

The references to the early history and customs of the people from the time of Abraham onward are so numerous in these prophets that Dr. Kuenen confesses that we should be compelled to suppose that at least Micah "was acquainted with those narratives" as contained in the Pentateuch, "unless appearances should tend to show that they were written or modified at a later date,"—that is, later than the time of these prophets;* and this Dr. Kuenen believes. They were *not* written till the time of the captivity, or two hundred years later than the time of these prophets. What these prophets say, therefore, about the early past, they have no authority for. They only express "*the idea which was entertained of that history in the eighth century*

* Vol. I., pp. 102, 103.

B.C." Be it so. Then it is only repeating the folly of the "wild ass that eateth up the east wind" to rake over the stories in Genesis and Exodus, which were not committed to writing till two centuries after this period, to supplement the "ideas" of the eighth century as given by these prophets. Our author does it, however, and concludes that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob "*are not historical personages.*" Nor are the twelve tribes descendants of Jacob's twelve sons. There may be some truth, but not much, in the account of the emigration from Egypt, the wandering in the wilderness, the entrance and partial conquest of Canaan, and the anarchical condition from the time of Joshua to the coronation of Saul. But he who believes least of what is told is the wisest man.*

Dr. Kuenen, however, becomes so enamoured with these old story-tellers that he gives us three chapters more upon "The Israelitish Prophets before and during the Eighth Century B.C.," and "The Course of Israel's Religious Development," and "The History of Israel's Religious Development before and during the Eighth Century B.C." Now let it be most distinctly understood that for every fact, or supposed fact, in these three chapters, covering two hundred and twenty-four pages, Dr. Kuenen is indebted to these same books which he affirms to have been written not only by men who lived from a thousand to five hundred years after the events described, but by men who "considered themselves exempted from all responsibility" to tell the truth! No statement of fantastic act in the life of Samson would be antecedently more incredible than

* Vol. I., p. 111 *et seq.*

this. And yet the thing has been done by a renowned scholar,— the pages are open before us in all their compact beauty. But if Dr. Kuenen's theory is correct, if his statements respecting the unhistorical character of these books are to be accepted, then it is the beauty of a harlot; for he can put no more historical truth into these chapters of *his* book than he finds in these books of the Old Bible; and, if they are untrue, these chapters are untrue. The same fountain cannot send forth sweet waters and bitter, truth and lies. The logic of the whole matter is, that methods and places of worship, customs and habits of life, prevailed, according to these writers, down to this eighth century, in direct violation of the Mosaic law as recorded in the Pentateuch, and which would *not* have prevailed had the Mosaic law been in existence or been known by the people. *Therefore*, the Mosaic laws, so called, were not composed till after the eighth century B.C.! A most magnificent *non sequitur*. As if the violation of a law was any evidence that the law was not on the statute-book! Or, to state the matter differently, as if the performance of an act was proof that there was no law against it, or that the existence of a custom was proof that there was no statute forbidding it. According to these "unhistorical" books of unknown authorship and irresponsible composition, other men than priests offered sacrifices, in other places than at the tabernacle. Punishments were inflicted by men having no authority, and which were cruel and vindictive to the last degree. The laws of Moses, in a word, were not observed, and *therefore* they did not exist,— one of

the most inconclusive inferences which could possibly be drawn. All history shows its fallacy.*

Passing on from the eighth century B.C., the next chapter treats of "The Religion of Israel to the Fall of Jerusalem, in B.C. 588." The only two points of special interest discussed in this chapter are (1) the reform under Hezekiah, who overthrew the altars of the idols, and cut down the groves [or the asheras], and made a very thorough change in the administration of the religion of the people; and (2) the finding of the "Book of the Law," in the reign of Josiah, by Hilkiah, the priest. It is necessary to pause a moment to consider the value of these incidents in settling the age of the Pentateuch.

Hezekiah attempted to reform the worship of the people, which, it is very important to note, for over a century had been growing grosser and grosser, like the ceremonies of the Romish Church during the Dark Ages. Idols were set up and altars erected and sacrifices offered on the "high places." The prophets denounced these practices in vain. The kings were satisfied to administer the civil law; and on grounds of

*It is objected repeatedly by other writers that the absence of the record of any enforcement of a law is sufficient proof that no such law existed. See *Unitarian Review*, October 1880, p. 300, *passim*. "Good kings did not remove idolatrous worship," therefore there was no law against idolatry. How much these good kings did toward ridding the kingdom of idolatry we do not know That they did not *wholly* succeed is all that can be inferred from the passage Can it not be said that we had good governors who did not shut up the liquor-shops, and good mayors who did not close the most popular gambling saloons? Does it follow that there was no prohibitory law in Boston, because there were more than two thousand bars where liquor was sold? We know there was. There are also hundreds of vile houses in Boston which the good mayor has not shut up. Is there no law against them? Such reasoning would not be tolerated in the lowest form of a grammar school. *See* pp. 46-48.

expediency, or supposing, by some method of interpretation of their own, that idol-worship was consistent with the worship of Jehovah, they not only permitted but encouraged it, as the popes encouraged image-worship and the selling of indulgences. The nation had departed no further from the requirements of the Mosaic law — assuming that it was given as early as his time — than the Church of the sixth to the tenth centuries had departed from the teachings of Christ. But customs are not easily changed; and, though Hezekiah appears to have been in earnest, he could not eradicate the religious rites and opinions which had been cherished and firmly rooted with increasing vigor for more than three generations. He did his best to purify their worship; but, when he died, reaction came, and a return to the long established and cherished customs. For two generations, or during the long reign of Manasseh, of fifty-five years, and the brief reign of Amon, of two years, idolatry was practised in its worst forms. The restraint under Hezekiah gave way to unbridled license under Manasseh, as the restraint of the Commonwealth gave way to the license of Charles II. and James II. He not only re-erected the "high places," but he "built altars in the house of the LORD, . . . and he built altars for all the hosts of heaven, in the two courts of the house of the LORD. And he made his son pass through fire, and observed times and used enchantments and dealt with familiar spirits and wizards." He set one of the abominable "graven images of the grove," as our translation names it to conceal its obscenity, "in the house of the Lord," in the very temple itself,— a baseness of profanation

of which even Athaliah did not dream or Ahaz attempt. *They* appear to have reverently closed the temple doors, and to have erected their idols only in the courts. Nor is this all. "Moreover, Manasseh shed innocent blood very much, till he had filled Jerusalem, from one end to the other." What horrors of martyrdom the reformers under Hezekiah suffered, these few words but dimly hint. The true prophets fled and concealed themselves, or were slaughtered. The true priests escaped as they could, and suffered all extremities, even to perishing with hunger. The reaction and persecution under Mary Tudor were not greater or bloodier or more merciless than those under Manasseh. And this prevalence of idolatry continued for seventy-five years, till Josiah again attempted a reform; and this persecution of Hezekiah's reformers continued till the last voice was silenced and the last hand cold.

Nothing in Dr. Kuenen's work has so awakened our regret, not to say our indignation in this instance, as his attempt to palliate the abominations and atrocities of Manasseh, saying that he "represented a conviction" as well as Hezekiah. The "account [of his cruelties] is unworthy of credit," affirms Dr. Kuenen. He only did what his grandfather Ahaz did in setting up idols, and causing his son to pass through fire! "Free from all exclusivism, Manasseh cannot well have become a persecutor of his own accord. If he took this part upon him, he was driven to it by the reception accorded to his measures!" No doubt. Mary Tudor's measures were not accepted; and, lo, the stake, the rack, the red-hot iron! Isabella's meas-

ures were not received; and, lo, the horrors of the Inquisition! We have read apologies for Judas Iscariot with considerable patience; for the poor fellow saw his guilt and shame, and hung himself. But we have no hint that Manasseh ever relented in his work of blood, or was abashed in the presence of his "groves," or "asheras." He persecuted as long as a hunted victim could be found. He practised his licentious rites as long as subjects for their lustful orgies could be furnished. He stands eminent among the Anakims of cruelty, though he had "a conviction," as Mary Tudor had, as James II. had, as Torquemada had,—"*a conviction*"! Heaven help us to escape "convictions"!

We now turn to consider the origin, character, and extent of the reform under Josiah. For personal reasons, probably, Amon, the son of Manasseh, after a brief reign of two years, was assassinated by his servants in his own house. The people punished the assassins, and placed his son Josiah, only eight years of age, on the throne. Under influences which are not named, his counsellors appear to have administered civil affairs wisely, without interfering with the forms of religion, till, in the eighteenth year of his reign, while the temple was undergoing repairs, Hilkiah, the high-priest, informs Shaphan, the scribe, that he had "*found the book of the law in the house of the* LORD." It was read before the King, and he was so moved in view of the sins of the people, as revealed by this "book of the law," that "he rent his clothes," and directed that measures should be taken at once to obey "the book of the law." He gathered the elders

of the people, and "the book" was read in their hearing, even "all the words of the book of the covenant." Then the King and the people "made a covenant before the LORD to walk after the LORD, and to keep his commandments and his testimonies and his statutes with all their heart and all their soul, and to perform the words of this covenant that were written in this book." The work commences of conforming to the law as recorded in this book. "The high-priest and priests of the second order" bring out of the temple all the vessels of Baal, and the shameful ashera, "grove," burn them, and carry the ashes to Bethel. He displaced the "idolatrous priests who burned incense in the high places unto Baal, to the sun and to the moon and to the planets and to all the host of heaven. He brake down the houses of the Sodomites, that were by the house of the LORD, and defiled the high places and Topheth." He burned to ashes all that would burn, and ground to powder all that could be pulverized, of the articles used in idol-worship; and, having cleansed the land of idolatry, he commanded the passover to be kept as directed "in the book of this covenant." But it was too late. Josiah was killed in a battle with Pharaoh-Nechoh; and under his sons the nation again relapsed into idolatry, and Jerusalem was taken, and the captivity followed.

Now, what was this "*book of the law of the Lord*" which aroused Josiah to attempt a radical reform in the religious practices of the nation? Dr. Kuenen says: "Moses bequeathed no book of the law to the tribes of Israel. Certainly, nothing more was committed to writing by him, or in his time, than 'the ten

words,'" the ten commandments, "in their original form." How, we ask with significant emphasis, how does Dr. Kuenen know that Moses wrote these "ten words"? or that they were written as early as his day? Where is the proof of it? None is given,—not a line, not a letter.* The testimony of the "inner consciousness" cannot be taken in this case; and we challenge him to bring any proof that Moses wrote "the ten words" which will not also prove that he wrote a great many words.† Dr. Kuenen says that the fragmentary laws in existence before Josiah's time would not satisfy what he calls the "Mosaic party,"— that is, the anti-idolatrous portion of the people,—and some one or more of them, Hilkiah or others, forged "a book of the law of the Lord," in the name of the old law-giver. "Notions about literary property were then in their infancy." They would have no "qualms of conscience" who declared they had "found" a book when they did not find it, but wrote it; nor when they attributed its authorship to Moses, *though they knew they lied!* The Mosaic party must gain their end at all hazards. "Now or never,"—hence forgery and lying are justifiable. That forgery — as unblushing and more criminal than the forged election returns in Louisiana,

*Some weak and inconclusive proof of a part of them is attempted, Vol. I., p. 283 and following.

† A writer in the *Unitarian Review*, November, 1880, pp. 435, 436, says the ten commandments, as written on the tablets of stone, are not given in the second writing, Exodus xxxiv., as in the first, Exodus xx. The historian says they were. Compare Exodus xxxiv., 1, and xxxiv., 27, 28. The writer mistakes when he understands that the laws given in this chapter were written on the two tables. They were written as the other laws were. Moses was commanded to write these words or commands because they were "*after the tenor*," based upon the words or commands *given before*. There were not ten of them, no more, no less; but a code of rules based upon the ten laws or commandments, which were written on the tables, and not here repeated. They are not said *to be the words* of the covenant, but "*after the tenor*," based upon them.

or the Decretals — was the Book of Deuteronomy; not the whole of it, but Deuteronomy iv., 44 — xxvi. and xxviii. These chapters, no more, no less, were deliberately forged for a religious purpose at this time. Now, what is the proof of it? Let us pick up as we may the alleged evidence produced by Dr. Kuenen.

1. "The first four books of the Pentateuch are more recent than the seventh century before our era"; and therefore they cannot be, either one or all of them, the book "found" or forged, the latter, not the former, in Josiah's reign. But this is simply taking for granted what must be proved. No evidence, not a line, has yet been brought by Dr. Kuenen to show that the first four books of the Pentateuch were not written till after this period, save that laws contained in it were often violated, and sometimes with impunity.

2. "Let it be further remembered that the writing found by Hilkiah is called the '*book of the law*,' and the '*book of the covenant*.'" It is true that in Deuteronomy iv., 44, we read, "And this is the law which Moses set before the children of Israel. These are the testimonies and statutes and judgments which Moses spake unto the children of Israel." And in chapter v., 2, 3, it is said that "the Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb." But in no place is Deuteronomy called "the book of the law," or "the book of the covenant." But we read in Exodus xxiv., 7, that Moses took *the book of the covenant*, and read in the audience of the people; and numerous sections of the other books of the Pentateuch are called "the law." The inference drawn by Dr. Kuenen, from the possible meaning of the phrases "the law" and "the

covenant," as used in Deuteronomy, is therefore not valid, and is far from proving that only the last book of the Pentateuch is referred to, excluding the others.

3. "It cannot have been of any great length, if we may believe the statement that it was read by Shaphan, and then read before Josiah in one day." This would be true of any of the sections named "*the law*" and "the covenant," which are contained in any of the books. These important sections might all be read more easily than twenty-three chapters in Deuteronomy. The only possible objection to this view is found in one word in the history of this transaction, II. Kings xxiii., 2: "And he read in their ears *all* the words of the book of the covenant,"— as if the whole of the book, whatever the topic, was read. There are large sections of Deuteronomy which have no special relation to the reforms instituted by Josiah; and laws respecting all his reforms are found in other portions of the Pentateuch. Certainly, Dr. Kuenen will not rest the proof that "*the book of the law*" read before Josiah was our present Book of Deuteronomy, on the single use of the word "all" by a historian who is not known, and who belongs to a class of writers who are said by himself "to consider themselves exempt from all responsibility" to write the truth. We however believe this writer was honest, and intended to tell the truth, and did tell it; and that what he said is that "all" was read which pertained to the Being whom they worshipped, and the place and form of worship then necessary to be known, and the penalties which would follow disregard of this law.

4. The final reason given by Dr. Kuenen for believ-

ing that Deuteronomy is "the book of the law" found, forged, by Hilkiah is that the customs reformed are all rebuked in Deuteronomy, and the penalties threatened for transgression are there written. But all these threatenings and all these laws are also contained in other books of the Pentateuch. It is not necessary, therefore, to infer that the reading would be confined to the last of the five books. Hilkiah or Shaphan may have made selections from any part of "the book of the law" which were appropriate to the occasion. What book this was which Hilkiah "found" or forged must be determined in a very different manner from that which Dr. Kuenen has adopted. In the proper place, we shall give it the consideration which it demands.

The seventh chapter on "The Israelitish Exiles in Babylon" contains so little which bears upon the question which we are discussing that we shall pass it by with the single remark that it is very full and able, giving a correct view of the condition of the exiles, and the influences of the peoples among whom they dwelt upon their religious ideas and forms.

The eighth chapter, which describes the return from the captivity and "The Establishment of the Hierarchy and the Introduction of the Law," demands special attention; for we are here told of the origin of the rest of the Pentateuch, and especially of the composition and introduction of the ritual law. As the subject is a large one, and our space is limited, we must confine ourselves to those points which have direct reference to the origin of the Pentateuch and the historical books.

Dr. Kuenen affirms in the strongest language * that "the priestly laws" and "priestly ordinances were made known and imposed upon the Jewish nation *now for the first time*," by Ezra, 457 B.C. "They were not laws which had been long in existence, and which were now proclaimed afresh and accepted by the people, after having been forgotten for a while. *No written ritual legislation existed in Ezekiel's time.*" † During the first thirteen years after Ezra's return, he perfected the code which he had brought with him from Babylon, *where he and others drew it up.* It received some modifications at the hand of Nehemiah, and perhaps others; and this code of laws was palmed off upon the returned exiles as "*God's law which was given by* ['the hand of'] *Moses, the servant of God*," and which they bound themselves by a solemn oath, under a curse, to obey. (Nehemiah x., 29.) No priest discovered the fraud; no scribe, versed in the traditions, customs, and laws of the nation, had a suspicion that this formidable, exacting, and onerous code was a barefaced forgery, a prodigious fraud; or else they were all silent in the very face of an imposition upon the credulity of a long-suffering nation without a parallel in the history of the

*Vol. II., p. 231.

† Dr. K. maintains that Lev. xviii.–xxvi. was written by or after the time of Ezekiel. There is not a shadow of evidence of it. The peculiar archaisms which are characteristic of the rest of the book and of all the Pentateuch are found in this section, which are not found in the extant writings of Ezekiel, nor in any other writing of the Old Testament subsequent to that of the Pentateuch. He must have taken great pains to imitate the style of the ancient books to conceal this fraud, or some scribe must have tampered with his copy to give it the antique form; and, further, he must have taken great pains in his extant prophecy to refer to this section as containing the laws given to the "fathers," and referring to this forged section as if given in ancient times in the "wilderness" (chapter xx., *passim*), when he knew that he wrote it himself.

world. The stupidity of these people must have been as amazing, as incredible, as was the fraud. There were men and women among these exiles who were not idiots, and who knew whether Ezra was introducing a ritual and law which were new, and not in accordance with the "customs" of the nation before the captivity. There were thousands of those who returned with Zerubbabel from the Babylonian exile, whose fathers had worshipped in the temple which Solomon built, and who were familiar with the whole ritual code. Could their children be blinded to such a degree as not to know a new code so minute in its details, reaching even to the kind and cooking of their food; the material, form, and make of their garments; the construction and care of their houses; the number, amount, and payment of their taxes; the rate of interest and collection of debts; the manner of treating strangers and slaves; the observance of the Sabbath, and the penalty of its desecration? And these are but a few of the laws which touched their persons, their homes, and daily occupations. The bare statement of an hypothesis which demanded such a belief would seem to be its sufficient and swift confutation. Imagine all the men and women and children of those exiles who had refused to sing the songs of their dear native land by the rivers of Babylon, and who had mourned over the loss of their homes, their temple, and their worship, when they had returned to erect anew their altar, and kindle anew its fires, to have had presented for their acceptance such a ritual as they had never heard of; such a religious administration as never before existed in the nation; and yet not a priest, not a Levite, not a

scribe, not a prophet, not a prophetess, ever hinted by word or line that this ritual, this code, was new; was not the ritual and code of the fathers; was not the manner of administration and form of worship which prevailed in the land before Jerusalem was destroyed and Judah carried captive! The great company which returned with Zerubbabel had built their homes, and established anew the worship of their nation in the rebuilt temple, and according to the "customs" of the fathers. For over half a century, for *fifty-eight years*, after the dedication of their new temple, "the priests in their divisions, and the Levites in their courses," had conducted the services of the temple, "as it *is written in the book of Moses*"; and twenty years before the temple was finished, on their arrival at Jerusalem, Jeshua and the priests and others "builded an altar to the God of Israel to offer burnt offerings thereon, as *it is written in the law of Moses, the man of God.*" They kept the feast of the tabernacle, "as *it is written*," and "offered the daily burnt offerings by number, according *to the custom.*" They also observed the "new moons, and all the set feasts of the LORD." This large company, with the "high priests" and the "priests" and "Levites" and "singing men" and "singing women" and the "porters" with "the vessels of gold and of silver," and "priests' garments" and "knives," had been keeping "passovers" and "all the feasts," and worshipping according to the "custom" of the fathers, "as written in the book of Moses," "in the law of Moses, the man of God," during two generations, in the undoubting belief that they were honoring God and obeying his law given to their fathers. And yet not a word

of astonishment or objection is spoken, no contention arises between these people and the company of Ezra when they return and he introduces his ritual and code which were "*never before heard of*," and "now *for the first time* imposed upon the Jewish nation"! Every tongue is dumb, every pen is idle; and this unparalleled monstrous forgery is accepted without a word of challenge, a shadow of suspicion, by a people which could boast of such writers as Amos, Isaiah, Micah, Jeremiah, Hosea, Joel, and the Psalmist! If so, the miracles of Egypt, as well as those recorded in the Book of the Judges, become mere commonplace affairs in the history of Israel.

Monstrously incredible as this hypothesis is, Dr. Kuenen has his reasons for adopting it. What are they? It is our duty, as reviewer of his work, to state and examine them. In doing this, we shall be obliged to adopt an order of our own, since Dr. Kuenen's reasons are spread over the whole work, and are interwoven with his whole argument, and are nowhere so arranged in separate paragraphs and distinctly announced as to make verbal quotations easy. We will, however, strive to cover his whole ground with the reasons which we shall name. It will be impossible to refer to the page on which the reasons which we shall state may be found, since they are implied or hinted or assumed through whole chapters, without a brief and clear enunciation. We omit, in this connection, as we shall have occasion to consider it hereafter, the difference in the *style* of the author or authors of the Pentateuch and that of Ezra and the writers of his time, which is to us most conclusive evidence that the Jewish

ritual was not the work of any writer who lived after the captivity.*

The first reason which we will notice offered in support of Dr. Kuenen's theory is that *no mention is made* of any such work as the Pentateuch, or any such ritual as it contains, in any work written before the captivity. The value of this reason will depend upon the number and character of the works thus early written. If very few works were written, and they were lyrical like the Psalms, or didactic like the Proverbs, or hortatory like many of the prophets, we should not expect to find formal quotations from the Pentateuch, assuming its early existence, any more than we should expect to find formal quotations from the Gospels in our Christian hymn-books, or in such sermons as Channing's and Robertson's and Bartol's and Martineau's. All that could be expected in such writings would be an occasional allusion, a particular expression, a special phraseology, which would indicate that the writers of these lyric and didactic and prophetic books were familiar with the contents of the Pentateuch, as the sermons of these preachers and the hymns of these poets show that they are familiar with the contents of the Gospels. Whether we do find any such indications of familiarity with the contents of the Pentateuch in the writers before the captivity will be determined subsequently in its proper place.†

But we are by no means willing to confine the testimony to the early origin of the Pentateuch to works written *before* the captivity. What sound reason can

* See "Study of the Pentateuch," under "*Style*," page 159 of this volume.

† See "Study of the Pentateuch," under "*Quotations*," page 104 of this volume.

be given for not accepting the testimony of those who wrote after the captivity to events transpiring and customs prevalent before it, if they have good authority for what they say which disappeared soon after, and had in their hands documents which have perished? None whatever. And here we must enter once more our most decided protest against Dr. Kuenen's wholesale accusation and condemnation of the Hebrew writers, historians, and others. There is no evidence that they were shamelessly destitute of veracity, "and considered themselves exempt from all responsibility" to tell the truth, "and fearlessly allowed themselves to be guided in their statements by the wants of the present and the requirements of the future"! After the events of the life of Samuel from 1100 B.C., the writers of Jewish history are exceptionally scrupulous to refer to their authorities. The writer of the Books of the Kings specifies at the close of every section where a full account of what he has very briefly narrated may be found. Bancroft and Palfrey and Parkman are not more scrupulous and frank in informing their readers of the sources of their information. He does not appear to think that he is writing to a set of ignoramuses who could be duped, nor to a party of demagogues who were to be flattered and sustained. Honesty and scholarship glow on every page. If the reader of the Books of the Kings is impressed with any one thing more deeply than another, it is with the truthfulness of the writer. Undoubtedly, he was sometimes mistaken in his interpretation of the old records on which he relied; but not wilfully to gain an end, but humanly as not omniscient. There is no reason to distrust his

statements respecting the laws, customs, and religion of the Jews, if he did write four or five hundred years after the reign of David, and closed his history with the fall of Jerusalem and the captivity of Judah; and we shall use his work freely and confidently when we have occasion to do so in this discussion.

We turn now to a consideration of the accuracy and value of the narratives in the Books of the Chronicles. These books are made the subject of the severest criticism by Dr. Kuenen. He accuses the writer of them of very slight regard for truth; of so coloring facts, and of inventing them when there are none, as to sustain the priestly ritual and code forged in the name of Moses by Ezra. Indeed, Dr. Kuenen may be said to believe and maintain that the Books of the Chronicles are substantially historical forgeries composed to give color of truth to the ritual forgeries of Ezra. The priests have invented a religion and forged a history to prove it true.* This all took place, and no scribe of the age, not a man of all the writers of the age, detected the cheat or exposed the falsifier of his nation's history. Mark the point. The writer of the Books of the Chronicles is not a blunderer, an ignorant pretender, an unfortunate bankrupt in authorities: he is an intelligent, deliberate, persistent, and determined falsifier of the annals of his nation which were in his hands; for this writer appeals as constantly to his authorities for his statements as does the writer of the Books of the Kings. Why, then, should Dr. Kuenen assume that where these historians, or rather annalists, differ, the writer of the Chronicles perverts

* Vol. III., p. 70 *et seq.*

or inverts or invents his facts? Why is it impossible that the writer of the Kings may be mistaken? Simply because it would spoil the whole of Dr Kuenen's theory; for it is past all possible question that the priesthood and the ritual are as old as the time of David, if the narratives in the Chronicles are substantially true. But *Carthago delenda est.* The early, especially the Mosaic origin of the priesthood and ritual must be false: *therefore*, every historian asserting its antiquity is thereby shown to be a liar or an ignoramus!

That the writer of the Chronicles is an antiquarian, and often busies himself about very small matters, is true. That he is given to genealogies is also true. That he writes an ecclesiastical and not a civil history is also true. But this does not prove that he deliberately lied, and said that things were as he knew they were not. Neal's *History of the Puritans* differs as much from Hume's history of the same period as the Chronicles differ from the Kings; and yet Neal is as reliable an historian as Hume. He dwells upon other topics and enlarges upon them, and is very diffuse upon some points which Hume omits or only touches. So we find it in the Chronicles. The writer lingers lovingly around topics which the writer of the Kings passes over very lightly or wholly omits, and sometimes they contradict each other. But this is no proof that either of them was a liar. Their authorities may have differed. The figures given in the Chronicles and in the other books are obviously unreliable, for some reason which is not yet explained. The blunders of copyists do not satisfactorily account for all of them. But these obvious mistakes do not affect in the slightest

degree the historical accuracy of the statements respecting the religious usages and legal ceremonies of the period of which the work is a fragmentary history,— indeed, only the briefest annals. The fact of a battle having been fought is not discredited because the number of killed and wounded is incorrect, and the name of the commander and the day of the fight are obviously misstated. Genealogies may be erroneous, and yet the events recorded may be substantially correct. It would be a miracle, indeed, if the writer of the Chronicles had made no mistakes in the names of his long lists of ancient families ; and a still greater one if the copyists of them for centuries had accurately, letter for letter, reproduced the original. We have tried our hand at both, and do not wish to condemn ourselves by accusing the writer of the Chronicles of being either an idiot or a knave because of the mistakes which are found in his work. There is open before me, as I write, the first volume of Savage's *Genealogy of New England*, a "very miracle of accuracy," and yet there are *twenty octavo pages* of "additions and corrections" at the end of it. How critics of the school of Dr. Kuenen would revel in a volume like this!

After the most patient and long examination of these books, we find nothing which proves or even indicates that their writer falsified his documents and invented incidents. As far as he writes the history of his nation, he writes as a priest would naturally write — religiously. He describes the acts of the priesthood much more fully than those of the civil magistrates. He does not bring his history down further than the destruction of Jerusalem. The books close with the issue

of the decree by Cyrus for the return of the captives, 536 B.C. The writer probably composed his work after the return of Nehemiah, and compiled from documents the so-called Books of Ezra and Nehemiah as a fitting appendix to his own work. We submit that there is no valid reason for supposing, with Dr. Kuenen and others, that the Books of Chronicles were not written as early as we have stated, simply because two genealogies of a few names are carried down to 250 B.C. These names might well have been added by a later hand. It may be assumed, therefore, with large measure of assurance, that all the historical books included in our Bible, as we now have them, were composed before 400 B.C., and that they are substantially reliable in their account of the affairs of the nation, both civil and ecclesiastical; that there is no evidence which would be admitted for a moment in any court of justice that these writers were arrant knaves, forging laws and falsifying history; that an indictment based upon such evidence as is adduced against the integrity and ability of these writers would be quashed by any modern court, or a *nol. pros.* would be entered by any prosecuting attorney.

A word must be said respecting the writings which treat of the affairs of the nation from the time of Moses to that of David, a period, according to Dr. Kuenen, of about three hundred years in round numbers,—1300—1000 B.C. The Book of Joshua gives an account of the conquest and division of the land of Canaan among the tribes, and covers a period of about thirty years. If we can rely upon a statement in chap. xvi., 10, "The Canaanites dwell among the Ephraimites

[in Gezer] unto this day," the book must have been written before the end of Solomon's reign, for we read, in I. Kings ix., 16, that Pharaoh took Gezer, burned it with fire, slew the Canaanites, and gave it as a present to his daughter, Solomon's wife. This passage would be of little value in overcoming opposing evidence, were there any; but there is none of any weight. The frequent use of the phrase "unto this day" implies some time after the events described, but is very indefinite. This Book of Joshua may have been written as early as the reign of Saul. There is no internal evidence against such a date for its compilation. Its subject is of the conquest, the battles, and the location of the tribes upon their portions of the land. No reasonable critic would expect to find much, if anything, which would treat of their religious manners and customs. What there is said about them we shall call attention to in the proper place.* If there were no allusion to anything of the kind, it would not surprise us, nor should we draw the astounding inference that they were a people without a religion and without a ritual.

The Book of Judges is a very composite work; but if we may rely upon a statement, chap. i., 21, that "the Jebusites dwell with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem unto this day," the book must have been written before the conclusion of David's reign; for we read in II. Samuel, v., 6–8, that David drove the Jebusites out of Jerusalem, and took the stronghold of Zion, and David dwelt in it. Another passage in one of the appendixes of the book, chap. xviii., 30, may indicate

* See "Study of the Pentateuch," under "*Quotations from Joshua*," page 142 of this volume.

that this portion was not written till two or three centuries afterward; for certain persons are said to have served as priests to the tribe of Dan "until the day of the captivity of the land," referring, apparently, to the deportation of the ten tribes of Shalmaneser and Esarhaddon, 721 B.C. As an apology for the lawlessness and insecurity of those days the writer of the appendixes especially calls attention to the fact that there was "no king in Israel in those days" (xviii., 1, and elsewhere). The book was possibly written as illustrative of the importance of a closer union of the tribes and of a stronger central government, or, more probably, it was the work of a curiosity hunter, who gathered the traditions of the most wonderful events which had happened during a period of civil and foreign wars, if border ravages and riotous outbreaks can be called wars, like the feuds of the Scottish clans, or the fights of Miles Standish and Captain Church with the Indians. The writer was an Israelitish Cotton Mather, and his book of the wonders of New England, *Thaumaturgus*, is the Puritan Book of Judges. No reasonable critic would expect to find much respecting religious affairs in such a work, covering three or four centuries in sixteen chapters, and devoting four of them to the exploits of Samson, the Israelitish Morrissey (we mean no disrespect to either champion: we make our apology to the shades of both). Whatever light the book will throw upon the subject we shall produce in due time.* We have said enough to show that Dr. Kuenen's argument, drawn from the *silence* of the book, is very weak, if not entirely destitute of force.

*See "Study of the Pentateuch," under "*Quotations from Judges*," page 141 of this volume.

The historical notices contained in I. Samuel, preceding the anointing of David, will require but a word of consideration. They were probably written by some earlier writer than the author of the Books of the Kings, and he may have continued the history to near the close of David's reign. The style is more diffuse than that of the author of Kings, and is freer from Aramæan or Chaldee words. What records he used, if any, he does not inform us; and the amount of credit which we give to his narrative will depend upon the probability of the events occurring under the circumstances described. Very strange things happen sometimes; and this rule, therefore, must be applied with great caution and modesty. Very little, if anything, respecting ecclesiastical affairs would be likely to be found in a brief description of the transition of the people from a state of anarchy and tribal rivalship and independence to the restraints of a monarchy and the authority of a central government. And what little there should be found would be such imperfect hints or such dissevered statements as would aid but little in forming a correct opinion of their religious rites and hierarchy. And if there were a ritual and a priesthood and an altar prescribed, it would be impossible in such stormy times to enforce or enjoy its observance, "every man for himself" doing what was right in his own eyes; and, as necessity knows no law, religious rites and ceremonies would be regarded or disregarded as circumstances compelled or permitted. If the appointed altar could not be reached, the sacrifice would be offered elsewhere; if the appointed priest could not be found, the next most worthy person would officiate; if the day appointed could not be observed,

the next day most appropriate would be chosen. Laws would not be enforced, criminals would escape, crimes would be winked at. Whether any evidence whatever exists in these narratives of the existence of any ritual or code of forms of worship will be the subject of future examination.* It certainly would not disappoint a student of history to find little or nothing on the subject. He certainly would not decide categorically, as Dr. Kuenen has done, that there was no such ecclesiastical polity in existence, because at this particular period of anarchy it was in abeyance, or because in these scraps of civil history and accounts of insurrections it was not specially mentioned.

On the contrary, Dr. Kuenen maintains that the ritual contained in the Pentateuch could not have been in existence during this period, because no direct reference is made to it by these writers, and because so much was done which was in violation of it. But who does not know that laws are violated, customs disregarded, rites neglected? Who does not know that the Thirty-nine Articles of the Episcopal Church are Calvinistic, and that its preaching is largely Arminian? Was the ritual, so to speak, of the gospel less ignored by the Church 600 —1000 A.D. than the ritual of the Pentateuch from Joshua to Hezekiah, if you please, six centuries? The inference from comparative silence and disregard is not a safe nor a sound one, where that silence can be explained and that disregard accounted for, as can easily and satisfactorily be done during the period before us. The narratives relate almost exclusively to civil affairs,

*See "Study of the Pentateuch," under "*Quotations from Samuel*," page 136 of this volume.

and, for the most part, in the briefest manner; and the people were governed by passions and appetites made greedy and lawless by centuries of slavery and suffering in the midst of the grossest idolatry, and therefore spurned the restraints of law and the denial of idol-worship. A people cannot be lifted in an hour or a century from ignorance, brutality, and idolatry to knowledge, refinement, and spiritual worship; and well may it have taken a millennium of struggle and failure and worshipping of asheras and Baals before these degraded slaves could accept a "spiritual monotheism," and burn their asheras, and understand that even their own ritual was an offence to God unless the heart was pure and the hands clean which observed it. We will quote, as we can, such authority as De Wette in support of our position: "The observance or non-observance of particular laws, the appearance or non-appearance of particular legal institutions, in a certain period, can prove nothing, either for or against the existence of a written law book." * We submit that the silence of these books respecting the existence and observance of the Mosaic ritual, and the few accounts of religious observances not conforming to it, are no valid proof that it did not exist, especially as against the later tradition of the nation. We shall in due time show that perfect silence does not pervade these books. We are now only dealing with Dr. Kuenen's argument.

Respecting the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah to which allusion has just been made, a few words must be said; for in these very brief fragments of the condition of the Israelites for about a century, 537—434

* Parker's De Wette, § 162, *a*.

B.C., after their return from captivity, we may find some evidence of Dr. Kuenen's remarkable theory. He thinks he does. Let us examine the books, and see what it is worth, if indeed there is any.

It is evident that the best-conditioned and most religious of the captives, those to whom "Jerusalem was their chief joy," would undertake the long desert journey, and attempt to rebuild the city and temple, and re-establish the services of the fathers. They were among the most intelligent and devoted of their race, and would be most solicitous to establish in its purity the worship of the fathers, and to render perfect obedience to those laws whose violation had been visited by the destruction of their city and the captivity of its citizens. The first company which went up under the lead of Zerubbabel as civil governor or king, and of Jeshua as high-priest and head of religious affairs, were accompanied by all the servants serving in the old temple worship, and carried back the vessels which Nebuchadnezzar had taken from the temple and carried to Babylon. There were about fifty thousand souls, — men, women, and children. On arriving at Jerusalem, they immediately erected an altar, and at once commenced worship in accordance with the custom of the fathers, offering sacrifices "*as it is written in the law of Moses, the man of God.*" They either had with them a written ritual, or they knew there was one which they remembered, and which they observed. They also arranged their singers after "*the ordinance of David, King of Israel,*" showing by this act also strict regard to the customs of the fathers. How Dr. Kuenen can say that they did not sing, but only "hoarsely shouted," can-

not be reconciled with Ezra iii., 11, which says, "And they, the priests in their apparel with trumpets, and the Levites, the sons of Asaph, with their cymbals, sung together by course in praising and giving thanks unto the LORD; because he is good, for his mercy endureth forever toward Israel"; and so thrilled were the multitude, as they heard again the old temple anthems, that they "shouted with a great shout, and the noise was heard afar off." There is not a shadow of evidence but that all this ritual service was familiar to them, and that it was observed as it was "written in the law of Moses, and after the ordinance of David." Having finished their temple, after twenty years' hindrance and hard labor, it was dedicated by the sacrifice of "bullocks and lambs and he-goats; by the priests in their divisions, and the Levites in their courses, for the service of God, . . . *as it is written in the book of Moses.*" They kept "the passover and the feast of unleavened bread." They also "kept the feast of tabernacles, *as it is written;* according *to the custom*, daily burnt offerings" were offered. There is not the slightest hint that the temple service was not continued for fifty-eight years, till Ezra and his company arrived, without intermission, and in accordance with the "custom" of the fathers, and as "it was *written in the book of Moses.*"

Did Ezra introduce any change? Did he make "known and impose upon the Jewish nation priestly ordinances, *now for the first time*" commanded? Were rites now introduced of which Zerubbabel and Jeshua, the king and high-priest, and these devoted exiles *knew nothing*, as Dr. Kuenen affirms?* Let us read

* Vol. II., p. 231.

what the fragments of history preserved in the Book of Ezra tell us on this subject. Ezra "was a ready scribe in the *law of Moses, which the Lord God of Israel had given*" (Ezra vii., 6); and he was a priest, great-grandson of Hilkiah, who found the "book of the law" in the reign of Josiah, if the genealogy is correct; and "Ezra had prepared his heart to *seek the law of the Lord and to do it*, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments." After a few days, "the princes," who apparently had succeeded Zerubbabel in the government, complained to Ezra, who came with authority from the Persian King, that the people had intermarried, *contrary to the law*, with the neighboring people. Ezra at once set about a reform, and a covenant was made to put away their unlawful wives. "And let it be done," they said, "*according to the law*." "Some of these wives had children," not all. The whole number of guilty persons was one hundred and thirteen only, out of a population of over fifty thousand. Not a great number, certainly, if we consider the condition of the people and the strength of the temptation. This act of Ezra is founded upon no new interpretation of "*the law written by Moses*," which had been the law of the nation from the beginning; much less was it a new law of Ezra's.

Nehemiah now visits Jerusalem. In his prayer for guidance before he left the palace in Shushan, he confesses that "we have not kept the commandments, nor the statutes, nor the judgments, which *thou commandest thy servant Moses*," as if he knew no code but the old code of the fathers,—the code which the returned people had used for three generations, "*as written in*

the book of the law of Moses." Complaint was made to Nehemiah that the poor were oppressed by the "usury" demanded, and some of them had lost their homes by the unlawful and cruel exaction of creditors. Nehemiah was "angry, and rebuked the nobles and the rulers, and directed them to leave off this usury and to restore their olive yards and houses." And they promised under oath to do so. After some years, Ezra again appears upon the stage as a teacher of the law. The people felt their need of fuller instruction. He used for this purpose "*the book of the law of Moses*, which the Lord had commanded for Israel." The same book evidently which Zerubbabel had used seventy years before, and of which Nehemiah spoke in his prayer. This old "book of the law" Ezra read and explained to the people. The devout wept when they learned how they had sinned. The direction to dwell in "booths" in the seventh month seems to have been new to them, though they had kept the "feast of the tabernacles" since their return.

A farther separation takes place from "strangers." In the ninth chapter, a synopsis of the history of the people is given as recorded in the Pentateuch, showing that the "law" which was read was supposed to have had its origin at that time; and the covenant of the fathers is renewed by the children, "to walk in God's law, *which was given by Moses, the servant of God*, and to observe and do all the commandments of the Lord, . . . and not to give our daughters unto the people of the land, nor take their daughters for our sons." And they promise to contribute to the support of the Levites "*as it is written in the law.*" All this is

in the Pentateuch, and is not spoken of as anything new. A selection of one man in ten is made by lot to dwell in Jerusalem. This is new; but it has nothing to do with the ritual. They further "*read in the book of Moses* that the Ammonite and the Moabite should not come into the congregation of God forever." They therefore "separated from Israel all the mixed multitude." Nehemiah, also, reformed the acts and labors of the people on the Sabbath, to conform to the "custom" of the fathers. This is all. There is not the slightest shade of evidence that Ezra introduced an entire new code of laws, never before known, but the contrary. A few new arrangements are made to meet the new condition, in which the people find themselves; but there is not a hint that anything new to which they were not accustomed, save in three or four instances at the most, and these unimportant, was added to "*the book of the law given by Moses.*" It is incredible that no breath of opposition should have been felt against this code, if it had not been what it claimed to be, "*the law given by Moses.*" It is incredible, if there had been any opposition on this ground, that no hint of it, nor the slightest trace of it, should be found in these accounts of the reorganization of the national worship. The very slight changes in a few forms, which changed circumstances compelled, by no means furnish proof or justify the suspicion that the whole post-captivity code was the invention of priests for selfish purposes, with Ezra at their head; and that he had the hardihood to proclaim to the people that it was the very "law given by Moses," and "written" by him. and observed by their fathers, and

whose violation, at last, was the cause of their captivity and renewed obedience to which would now make them prosperous; and that the people were so stupid as not to detect the fraud and expose the deceivers, and visit them with swiftest and severest punishment; or, if they did, that all record of this detection, opposition, and punishment, should have been lost by accident, or erased by design, from both history and prophecy. That the *historical books* contain no evidence of such a ritual-forgery palmed off upon the returned exiles, we have already fully shown. Nay, more: we have shown that every fragment of these annals, every shred of the story, informs us that this "law" was the old law, and that this ritual was the ritual of the fathers. We turn now to examine the teachings of the prophets during this period, to see whether Dr. Kuenen's appeal to them in support of his theory is of any more value than his appeal to history. Unless we utterly mistake, this support will also prove to be a broken reed which will pierce him through who leans upon it.

(1) Dr. Kuenen says "that when Ezekiel, in the year 572 B.C., wrote his description of the new Israelitish State (chaps. xl.—xlviii.), no written regulations for religious worship, no complete priestly legislation, yet existed." And he says further, "that no evident trace of these laws, or of the spirit which they breathe, is to be found in the prophecies which saw the light toward the end of the captivity,—about 538 B.C.*

Ezekiel we will notice first, as being probably the earliest of the group, then the later Isaiah and Zechariah, and then Haggai and Malachi. Ezekiel was not

* Vol. II., p. 153.

of the company carried to Babylon. He was a dweller on the remote river Chebar. The description which he gives (chaps. xl.—xlviii.) of the division of the land among the returned exiles, whenever they should return, and of the temple they would build, is purely ideal, and as impracticable, should an attempt be made to make it real, as the throne or chariot of the Deity which he describes in chapter i. is impracticable. This Dr. Kuenen admits apparently, but he will not admit that Ezekiel would have given play to his imagination in describing the "ritual" of his ideal temple. Why not? Was the sacrifice more sacred than the altar? Was the priest's attire more holy than the "holy of holies"? Why, then, should the prophet restrain his pen in describing the "snuffers" and the "snuffer-trays" and the "tongs" and the robes, when he had not shrunk from describing ideally the altar and the holy place? The presumption is that he would not. "Why did he go into these minute descriptions of the ritual, if he had the Pentateuch? Why did he not content himself with a simple reference to the Mosaic laws?" asks Dr. Kuenen. If Ezekiel was here, we have no doubt he would reply, Because I was writing a poem, and wished to fill out my ideal state and temple and ritual in every particular. Besides, Ezekiel clings close to the forms and substance contained in the Pentateuch which he idealizes in his poem. Dr. Kuenen says "he was not acquainted with the whole of the Mosaic law. Deuteronomy and the still older book of the covenant are presupposed by him throughout, but nothing beyond these collections." Now the fact is this: by a careful collation of the passages and references which

are found in Ezekiel, nearly the whole ritual as it is contained in the Pentateuch could be obtained. Ezekiel uses the whole of the ritual as it stands in the Pentateuch; that is, all which his work demanded. Could space be given, we would prove it by an examination of the passages quoted. It must suffice, however, to say that Ezekiel shows himself to be perfectly familiar with the "law of Moses" as recorded in the Pentateuch, writing in a distant part of the country, one hundred and fourteen years before Ezra went up to Jerusalem, and thirty-six years before the great migration under Zerubbabel, who had regard in offering sacrifices to what "was written in the law of Moses, the man of God," and who arranged the courses of the priests "as it is written in the book of Moses."*

(2) We turn to examine the support furnished to Dr. Kuenen's theory by the later, or "Deutero," Isaiah. This writer "lays special stress upon *Jahveh's oneness*"; he expresses most significantly his contempt of false gods; he is a strong "monotheist." There is not a passage which implies the non-existence of the ritual law or of the Pentateuch, but much to the contrary. He speaks of the worthlessness of the ritual unless the heart is in its observance; but this is evidence for the existence of the ritual, and not proof that it did not exist. As we shall have occasion to recur to this writer again before we finish this discussion, we waive farther examination of his work till then, having said sufficient to show that Dr. Kuenen's inference is unfounded.†

* For further proof, see "Study of the Pentateuch," under "*Ezekiel*," p. 105.

† See "Study of the Pentateuch," under "*Isaiah*," p. 112.

(3) But a word is necessary upon the writings of the later Zechariah. He was a contemporary of Zerubbabel, and the numerous visions which he describes assume the existence of the ritual, though no direct reference is made to it. Indeed, Dr. Kuenen does not appear to place much reliance upon his silence as valid evidence that the ritual was not in existence, and regarded as far as the circumstances would allow.

(4) The prophet Haggai, in the brief fragment of only two chapters of his writings which have come down to us, uses the language of the Pentateuch, and speaks of "the law," as respecting things "clean and unclean." Dr. Kuenen infers from chap. ii., 11, because the prophet directs the people to inquire "concerning the law" of the priests, that there were no "enactments of the written law": "only a priestly tradition existed." As if, because one was referred to the lawyer when he inquired after the "law" on a certain subject, we should infer that there was no statute, written law, but only the tradition of the bar. It so happens that the very point inquired about is stated and decided in Numbers xix., 11. Haggai furnishes no support to Dr. Kuenen's theory.

(5) The brief prophecy of Malachi, who was a contemporary of Nehemiah, is thought by Dr. Kuenen to give support to his theory, because he shows that "Ezra and Nehemiah in their attempt at reform met with strong opposition." The people violated the law in various ways, and some of them despised Jahveh's name. But this "law" which Malachi denounces the people for disregarding and violating is no forgery of the priesthood and Ezra, no new ritual palmed off

upon the nation by a conspiring hierarchy, Nehemiah assenting and abetting,— it was none other than "*the law of Moses*," the servant of Jehovah, which God "*commanded him in Horeb for all Israel*." If Malachi reproved the people, it was for transgressing the "*law as it was written by Moses*"; and, if the people opposed Ezra and Nehemiah, it was because they enforced against evil-doers "*the law as written by Moses*," and not a fraudulent code of Ezra's. There is not a shadow of evidence that any opposition arose against the administration of these men because they introduced "new laws never before heard of"; but all the evidence that exists of the opposition itself as well as of its cause implies or affirms that it originated in the enforcement of laws whose violation was the cause of their captivity, and whose origin was in the ancient days, "*in Horeb*," and whose author "*was Moses, the man of God*."

The prophetical writings of this period not only give no countenance to Dr. Kuenen's theory, but they oppose it in letter as well as in spirit.

We have now examined the main reasons adduced by Dr. Kuenen in support of his hypotheses of the origin of the Pentateuch, as they are less frequently stated than implied in these volumes. To discuss every point affirmed or suggested, to challenge every statement which is doubtful or incorrect, to expose every fallacious inference from conceded facts, would demand as many volumes as the original work. We have omitted nothing vital to his argument.*

See Appendix B, page 66.

Thus far in the discussion, we have been laboring at a disadvantage. We have been proving a negative. We have been showing that the arguments adduced by Dr. Kuenen are not valid to sustain his theory of the late and forged composition of the Pentateuch. The positive argument for its antiquity and substantial genuineness does not appear. Dr. Kuenen's argument in support of his theory may be confuted, and yet his theory may be correct. We propose, therefore, to discuss the question positively and affirmatively, confuting his theory indirectly by an examination into the age and authorship of the so-called Books of Moses directly and critically, as we have confuted his arguments in support of it by testing their logical and historical value. We gird ourselves to the work in the assurance that the antiquity of the Pentateuch can be vindicated, and that the Mosaic origin of most of its contents can be established.

APPENDIX A.*

In *The Bible for Learners*, by Dr. H. Oort, Professor of Oriental Languages, etc., Amsterdam, and Dr. T. Hooykaas, pastor at Rotterdam, with the assistance of Dr. A. Kuenen, Professor of Theology at Leiden, there are abundant specimens of these "flimsiest speculations." I quote a few to justify to the reader the use of such language respecting the works of this school of critics.

"The tabernacle," Dr. Oort says, "never really existed, except in the imagination of the writer," who lived after the captivity. This writer must have been infatuated with this creation of his imagination, of "rams' skins dyed red," and "badger skins," and "fine-twined linen," and "loops and couplings, blue upon the edge, and taches and curtains of goats' hair, and boards of shittim wood, and two tenons on one board, and forty sockets of silver, two sockets under one board, and bars of shittim wood, five bars for the boards of the tabernacle on the one side, and five bars for the boards of the tabernacle on the other side, and the middle bar in the midst of the boards shall reach from end to end," etc.,— must have been infatuated, indeed, for he repeats the wearisome, dry details in the following chapters, which one has hardly patience to read once.

The "representation of the camp of the Israelites," as given in the Book of Numbers, we are told "the writer

* See page 8.

had invented and worked out himself." No truth is in it. We must class it with the historical "lies," for there is no doubt about the writer's intending that his readers should believe it was a true description of the work of Moses.

Dr. Oort tells "learners" that "the prophet Malachi [420–450 B.C.] is the first to use the expression 'law of Moses.'" Now, the title is used I. Kings ii., 3, and II. Kings xxiii., 25, books acknowledged by such critics as De Wette and Davidson to have been written about 550 B.C. And the title is also used by the writer of the Book of Joshua, placed by the same critics about 650 B.C., or two centuries earlier than Dr. Oort admits that the title was used. Dr. Oort tells "learners" that "the very name given to . . . the Mount of Sinai signifies the moon-god." We do not say that some modern critics are moon-struck, but the moon has as much influence on their criticism as it has on the meteorology of the rustic. Gesenius (Hebrew *Thesaurus*, *ad verb.*) says Sinai signifies "*lutum*," "mire"! Again, Dr. Oort tells "learners" that "the very name of the hero himself [Samson] signifies 'sun-god.'" Gesenius says it signifies "sunlike." These assertions need no comment. They admonish "learners" to choose judicious teachers, and to beware of disregarding truth, as the Hebrew writers are said to have done.

Dr. Oort seems disposed, at times, to give the worst interpretation possible to popular phraseology. For example, he says the proverb, as used in Ecclesiastes, "A living dog is better than a dead lion," means, "Life, though branded with infamy, is preferable to the most honorable of deaths"! The real meaning of the pro-

verb is, while there is life there is capacity, activity, hope of change from misfortune and sorrow; but when dead we are good for nothing, can do nothing, can hope for nothing. "Infamy" is not said to be "preferable to death." So base a sentiment could not be found among the Ojibways.

We will take one of Dr. Oort's myths, and learn his style of interpretation. Solar myths are fashionable now among the critics; and the story of Samson opens a rich field for fancy to riot in, as Dr. Oort in his chapter on this Hebrew athlete illustrates. He opens his criticism with a reference to Osiris and Horos and Typhon and Herakles and Balder and Loki, original solar myths; and, as the "very name" of the hero "Samson" signifies "sun-god," the reader is admonished in the outset of the solar myth to be narrated. A rhetorical description, in his own language, is given of the interview of the angel and Manoah, the father of Samson. He then interprets: "Samson had long hair. These long hairs are rays of the sun. The angel who rises up in the flame of Manoah's sacrifice signifies the glow of the dawn that blazes against the heavens, and heralds the approach of the sun who brings to the world fresh life." This is rich, but there is richer in store. Dr. Oort gives a glowing description of Samson's exploits, "killing the lion," "getting honey from the carcass," and his riddle about it. A very simple thing for a fellow like Samson to do. Now for the mythical interpretation. The "lion" is a "sign in the zodiac." "Samson rends the lion; that is to say, the sun passes through the constellation of that name." . . . "How did sweet food, honey, proceed from the strong and ravenous lion?" . . . "When

the sun passes through the lion, the bees make their combs; and, when he leaves it, the honey is ready." Is not this richer? Instead of saying, what was not at all improbable, that a swarm of bees had made honey in the hollow, bone-covered portion of the fleshless remains of the slain beast, we are directed to the constellations for an answer to the riddle. It is no wonder that the Philistines did not guess the riddle, and it is a wonder that Samson was such a fool as to think they did when they did not; for they only thought of the real beast: they had no zodiacal signs in mind.

Now for the story of the jackals (foxes), tied "tail to tail, with a burning torch between them," and sent among the Philistines' wheat all ready to harvest, which so provoked them that they followed him to Lehi, where he was delivered up by his friends, who feared the vengeance of the Philistines, bound with two new ropes. But, when the Philistines shouted and came upon him, he snapped the ropes, and seized the jaw-bone of an ass, and slew them by the thousand; and they fled; and, when he was thirsty, he cried to Yahweh, and "God split the hollow of the jaw-bone, and water flowed out from it to drink." One word of criticism before proceeding to give the mythical interpretation of this exploit. The water did not flow from the hollow in the jaw-bone of the ass, used by Samson in beating off the Philistines, but from a hollow, a spring, in Lehi, the place where the squabble was. Now, the Hebrew word Lehi signifies "jaw"; and Dr. Oort thinks the Lehi where the spring of water was was the jaw-bone of the ass, and not the place Lehi. Our translators made a mistake in translating the name:

"But God clave a hollow place that was in the jaw," when they should have said, "a hollow place that was in Lehi." There was a spring of water in that place, Lehi, which Samson found and drank from. This is all.

But it is time to give Dr. Oort's mythical interpretation. In "the reddish-brown jackals, with torches between their tails, we easily recognize the lurid thunder-clouds, from the projecting points [tails?] of which lightning flashes seem to dart." "When he has triumphed over his foes, the sun-god no longer uses the thunder-cloud as a weapon, but makes the rain pour out of it. This explains why Samson threw away his weapon after the victory, and that a spring rose from the hollow of the jaw-bone." This is certainly richer still!

Patience! But one more specimen remains. Samson loses his locks by the betrayal of Delilah, and grinds in the mill of the Philistines, among the women. His hair grows again; he is taken out to make sport for the curious multitude, who so pile the roof of the building that, by a push upon a couple of its pillars, it fell, and killed many besides Samson. All very probable and intelligible, and substantially true, past all reasonable question. Now for the solar-myth interpretation. Losing his locks in the winter months, "the sun-god is gradually encompassed by his enemies, mist and darkness. He loses all his power and glory. Gradually his strength returns, and at last he reappears, . . . and, in the end, triumphs over his enemies once more. This final victory is represented by the scene in the Temple of Dagon." The sun dies every year, and comes to life again; but "Samson was buried between Zorah and

Eshtahol, in the burying-place of Manoah, his father," and we hear no more of him. Such is the interpretation of the stories of the Bible commended to "learners." It is true that this is the most extravagant one of all that have come under my observation; but the only reason why others are not as extravagant seems to be that no others furnish such opportunity for the revels of imagination. If this is criticism, what would be travesty?

An instance of the way the author has of charging the Hebrew writers with disregard of truth, and of falsifying their own records, is found in his account of the story of Korah.* "A later priest," he says, "who accepted the story as historical, was sadly perplexed by the fact that Korah's family not only still existed, but was held in high honor. He therefore took the liberty of making a note to the effect that Korah's children did not perish with him (Numbers xxvi., 11), thereby contradicting the story itself, which expressly says that both he and his were destroyed" (Numbers xvi., 32). Now, the original account does *not* say that the *children* of Korah were swallowed up. It does not even say that *Korah* was swallowed up. It says that "Dathan and Abiram came out and stood in the door of their tents, and their wives and their sons and their little children; . . . and the earth opened her mouth and swallowed *them* up, and *their* houses, and all the *men* that appertained to Korah, and all *their* goods. *They*, and all that appertained to *them*, went down alive into the pit." . . . Not a word is said that Korah was there with Dathan and Abiram when the earth opened. It is *nowhere* said

* Vol. II., page 523.

that Korah or his children were swallowed up. It is nowhere said that Korah, himself, was killed, either by the opening of the earth or by the "fire that came out from the Lord and consumed the two hundred and fifty men that offered incense" "at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation." But, as Moses had told Korah the day before to be present with his company at that place, it is a fair inference that he was one of the two hundred and fifty who were "consumed by fire from the Lord at the door of the tabernacle," while Dathan and Abiram and their families were swallowed up in another part of the camp, where were the tents of Reubenites. So far is it, therefore, from being true that Hebrew writers "concerned themselves very little with the question whether what they narrated really happened so or not," that they excelled, in accuracy of writing and scrupulous regard to facts, some of their modern readers and commentators.

APPENDIX B.*

Some of Dr. Kuenen's affirmations are too important to be passed by in entire silence.

(I.) Dr. Kuenen affirms (Vol. II., p. 299) "that the Deuteronomist considers *all* Levites, without distinction, qualified to fill the priestly office," and "that a reconciliation of Deuteronomy with Exodus—Numbers is not to be thought of." This, he affirms, is certain "from Deuteronomy x., 8, 9; and xviii., 1–8, where he [the Deuteronomist] expresses himself quite unambiguously." . . . "He directly contradicts them [Exodus—Numbers] . . . and expressly allows (Deuteronomy xviii., 6, 7) that which, according to the priestly lawgiver (Numbers xviii., 3), is punished with death.

We take distinct issue with Dr. Kuenen on this point. In Deuteronomy xviii., 6, 7, we read, "If a Levite come from any of thy gates out of all Israel where he sojourned, and come with all the desire of his mind unto the place which the Lord shall choose, there he shall minister in the name of the Lord his God, *as all his brethren the Levites do*, which stand before the Lord." Now what says Numbers xviii., 2, 3? "And thy [Aaron's] brethren of the tribe of thy father, bring them with thee, that . . . they may minister unto thee; but *thou* and *thy* sons with thee shall minister *before the tabernacle of witness*, and *they* shall keep thy charge and the *charge of all the tabernacle;* only they shall *not* come

* See page 57.

nigh the *vessels of the sanctuary and the altar*, that neither they, nor ye also, die." And further on in this chapter many specific duties of the Levites, as distinguished from those of the priests, are enumerated. Where, we ask with emphasis, does Numbers "expressly contradict" Deuteronomy? What does Deuteronomy "expressly allow" which Numbers "punishes with death"? Both direct that Levites may serve at the tabernacle, Numbers specifying their duties, Deuteronomy only saying that the persons specified "*should serve as all the Levites do*"; that is, as directed in Numbers. We renew our question with stronger emphasis, Where is the "direct contradiction"?

Now let us examine the *first* affirmation that "*all* Levites, without distinction, [were] qualified to fill the priestly office," according to Deuteronomy viii., 9; xviii., 1–8. We have already quoted the important portion of the latter passage, and have only to remark that all attempts to build up a theory of the Jewish priesthood and the identity of the office of the priest and the Levite, because of the use of the phrase, "The priests, the Levites," are futile. All priests were Levites, but "*all*" Levites were not qualified for priests; and this idiomatic phrase proves only that priests were Levites. A critical examination of this Hebrew idiom would take too much space, and lead us into details too dry and minute to interest our readers; and we refer them to the *constructio asyndeta* of the Hebrew grammars. We turn, therefore, to notice the other passage, which proves that "*all* Levites, without distinction, [were] qualified to fill the priestly office," Deuteronomy x., 8, 9. It reads thus: "At that time

[at Mount Sinai] the Lord separated the tribe of Levi to bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord to minister to him, and to bless in his name unto this day. Wherefore Levi hath no part nor inheritance with his brethren; the Lord is his inheritance, according as the Lord thy God promised him." What is there in this passage to show that "all" Levites were or might be priests? Not a line. The duty of the *tribe* of Levi is specified in the briefest manner, including the service of *both* priests and Levites, into which two classes the tribe is elsewhere said to be divided. "The reconciliation of Deuteronomy with Exodus — Numbers is not to be thought of," therefore, only because there is nothing to reconcile. Where there is no contradiction, there is no demand for conciliation. Dr. Kuenen's inference, therefore, that, since the Deuteronomist makes no distinction between the priest and Levite, he must have written before the "priestly ritual" of Exodus — Numbers and of Ezra was composed, is without support. Dr. Kuenen has mistaken an eddy for the current.*

(II.) Dr. Kuenen says again (Vol. II., p. 116), "Ezekiel is the first to desire other rules [than that all Levites might officiate as priests] *for the future:* after the return of Israel to her native land, 'the sons of Zadok' shall be the only lawful priests." But it is evident from the context (Ezekiel xliv., 10 – xlv.) that

*The statement, *Unitarian Review*, Nov. 1880, p. 937, that, "before this captivity, the terms 'priest' and 'Levite' are synonymous," is incorrect, as shown "(III.)"; and another writer echoes Kuenen's statement to the same effect, and further informs us that Kuenen "revised his whole scheme of Israel's history" on account of this supposed synonymousness of "priest" and "Levite." A pyramid on its apex, surely. See "The Levitical Priests," by Curtis.

Ezekiel had reference in this passage to the Levites, and priests of the family of Aaron, who had served at the altars of false gods in the reigns of Hezekiah and Josiah, and who had thus forfeited their claim to their official position; and as the "sons of Zadok" only of the family of Aaron remained loyal to Jehovah, they alone could officiate as priests. The most sacred services of the temple could be performed by them alone. Ezekiel desires no new rule. He only enforces an old one that those who forsake Jehovah and serve at the altars of false gods shall not serve at his altar. Dr. Kuenen is betrayed into this error by his not seeing that the priests are sometimes spoken of as Levites of whom they formed a part when the writer refers to the position and duties of the *tribe* as a body. And while in some instances it must be confessed that the sacred writers are not so clear as is desirable, yet nothing but an "assumed" theory could have led the author so far astray.

(III.) Again, Dr. Kuenen says (Vol. I., p. 325), "In David's days, no one thought of either the descendants of Aaron or the Levites being the only persons competent to discharge the functions of priests." This is a remarkable statement to make, when not the name of a person acting as priest is mentioned who is not a descendant of Aaron. The legitimate inference is that, where names are not mentioned, the "priests" who are officiating at the altar are the posterity of Aaron. Priests and their services are mentioned frequently during the reign of David by the writer of the Books of Samuel and Kings, and not a hint is given that they are not Aaronic.

(IV.) Dr. Kuenen says (Vol. I., p. 208): "*In the*

eighth century B.C., the prophet of Jahveh has become a writer. . . . It does not appear that the older prophets . . . thought of writing down what they had spoken." Yet we read that the "acts of David and Solomon," in the ninth and tenth centuries B.C., were "written by Nathan, the prophet," and also "in the visions of Iddo, the seer," and also in "the book of the prophet Gad, David's seer" (I. Chronicles xxix., 29; II. Chronicles ix., 29). The only marvel is that so much, not that so little, of the early miscellaneous literature of the Hebrews was preserved, when we remember the fortune of that people.

(V.) Dr. Kuenen says (Vol. I., p. 273), "Probably not one of the Psalms is from David's hand." So destructive a critic as Hitzig claims that he wrote ten certainly, perhaps more. And Ewald claims fifteen, and probably several others. Davidson claims still more. So does Eichorn, and Dr. Noyes, also. A dozen eminent Hebrew scholars might be named who believe that David wrote from twenty to eighty of the Psalms; but it is not necessary. Every student of the Hebrew Scriptures knows them. But general readers are widely and sadly misled by such statements, and judicious, reliable scholars do not make them.

(VI.) Dr. Kuenen is very confident that he can pick out the portions of the "Book of Origins," or the Elohim document, from Exodus — Numbers; and he confides in the accuracy of his dissection with an assurance which is surprising to one who has made the subject a study. The fact is, *no* confidence can be placed in any of these attempts to find and define the supposed documents of which some writers affirm that

these books are composed. We have given the subject a careful and most minute study, and we say without hesitation that all these attempts are abortive. Some specimens will be given taken from Kuenen (Vol. II., p. 163—). "Exodus xii., 1–23, 28, 37 (?), 40–51, are from his [Elohist's] hand." Now, this writer calls the Supreme Being, in Hebrew, Elohim, God, as distinguished from the later writer who calls the Supreme Being, in Hebrew, Jehovah, Lord. This is a "chief characteristic" of his style. In this passage, quoted by Dr. Kuenen as written by the Elohist, the name "Jehovah" is used *fifteen* times and "Elohim" not *once.* In another passage, "Exodus xxv., 1; xxxi., 17," Jehovah is used *forty* times and Elohim but *three* times. Theodore Parker says, "I would rather consider the whole passage as Jehovistic." Again, "Exodus xxxv.–xl.," Jehovah is used *thirty-three* times and Elohim *once.* Theodore Parker says, "To me, this passage seems Jehovistic throughout." Again, "Leviticus viii.–x.," Jehovah is used *forty* times, Elohim *not once.* Again, "Numbers xv.–xix.," Jehovah is used *fifty-seven* times and Elohim *twice.* Once more, "Numbers xxvi.–xxxi.," Jehovah is used *fifty-two* times and Elohim but *once.* It is not necessary to extend this note further. The "chief characteristic" of the Elohim document almost entirely disappears in the passages attributed to the Elohist writer by Dr. Kuenen, and the "chief characteristic" of the Jehovistic writer is found in them. This is sufficient to show the fallacy of the whole criticism; for, if the "chief characteristic" of one of the theoretical documents is found to be almost universally used in the other in practice, either the theory or the practice is sadly at fault.

A STUDY OF THE PENTATEUCH.

A STUDY OF THE PENTATEUCH.

INTRODUCTION.

THE Pentateuch, as well as other writings claiming a high antiquity, has been made to pass the fiery ordeal of criticism since the revival of Oriental learning, and, like not a few of them, has been denied the venerable age which had before been awarded to it. I do not complain that these writings have been tried in so purifying a fire. Nor will I complain that there has been some rashness manifested in this process of purification, since, in all first attempts, more or less imperfection must exist. But I have no doubt that it will be found in the end, after thorough scholarship and laborious research have done their work, that many of those writings, whose antiquity has been denied, will again be installed in their original places of reverence and age. The tendency is in that direction, even at this time; and it will grow stronger and stronger as the discoveries of scholars in the ruins of the ancient cities give decisive evidence of the general, and sometimes minute, accuracy of the accounts which these books contain, and of a literature as abundant, as various, and as copious as is found in the Pentateuch.

There was a time, and it is not long since, when the history of Herodotus was looked upon as largely myth-

ical, as composed of "tales imposed upon the credulity of the Father of History"; but almost every modern discovery goes to confirm the general accuracy of Herodotus, and convict the incredulity of his critics. The same is true of other ancient documents, and fragments of documents, which have come down to our day. Thorough modern research seems to be fast confirming the old opinion respecting the antiquity and authenticity of the writings which claim to be the work of ancient men.

The Old Testament writings have shared to some extent the fate of the writings of Herodotus and other ancient authors. Their historical parts have been put to the test of criticism, and have been declared wanting. But recent discoveries and more thorough examination are confirming their general accuracy, and winning back to them a continually increasing portion of the confidence which they formerly commanded. Especially is this true of the Pentateuch. The writings of Moses, as they are usually called, have been subjected to the closest scrutiny by the most profound scholars. Perhaps no work claiming its origin in remote antiquity has passed through such an ordeal, and with such various results. In the first instance, a very modern date was given to it. The age of Ezra was reported by some as that in which it first saw the light. The date of its origin has, however, been receding; and generally an antiquity considerably higher is now conceded to it by most of the same school of critics.

But it is not my purpose to write a history of the progress of criticism upon the age and authenticity of the Pentateuch. I have made these remarks to notify

my readers of the present tendency of that kind of criticism, which has been, by some defenders of the ancient records, styled "destructive," that they may be better able to appreciate the force of the arguments which I propose to adduce in this study, to show that the Pentateuch is of the age of Moses; that there are reasons, by no means without weight, for the opinion that the first five books of the Old Testament, called the Pentateuch, were in the main compiled and written either by Moses himself or by one or more of his contemporaries, perhaps under his direction, or, at the latest, by his immediate successors. It is no part of my plan to prove the authenticity of these books,— the truth of the statements made in them,— though incidentally I shall touch that subject. My object is a single and simple one. I wish to present the reasons which have induced many of the most eminent scholars and the great mass of believers, so far as they have had reasons to give for their belief, for attributing the Pentateuch to an author or authors of the Mosaic Age. Nor do I propose to show or maintain that these writings have come down to us without damage, in their original state precisely. I shall assume that they have met with the same fate in their transmission to our age which has befallen all other ancient writings. Nor shall I claim for them any inspiration, in any sense of that word. I shall examine them as I would any other writings of antiquity.

I propose this only as my theme,— to examine the evidence of the origin and age of the first five books in our Bible, commonly called the Pentateuch. I call this essay a Study, because it is the result of my own

personal investigation extending over a period approaching half a century, and during a portion of which time my duty as teacher at Meadville required me to read the Pentateuch, as well as the rest of the Hebrew literature contained in the Old Testament, annually with the students; and nothing has surprised or pained me more of late years than the careless facility with which even men having the reputation of scholarship copy and adopt the statements of others, especially if they have come over the sea, without verifying them; and are not only led far astray themselves, which would be little, but they lead far astray multitudes of others who confide in them, just as if they were authority, and knew themselves, by their own studies, whereof they affirm. The credulous, confiding public is flooded with books and pamphlets written without knowledge and published without thought. It is a very easy thing to do to rewrite a dry, dull book into a fresh and attractive one, and to scatter broadcast in volume or pamphlet, in essay or sermon, the crude, wild, baseless theories and hypotheses of persons who, like the old Athenians, have nothing to do but to tell some new thing, or startle men with some astonishing discovery, or mortify them with some bold irreverence. No responsibility seems to be felt for the influence of opinions, and little regard is paid oftentimes to truth. There is hot haste to get every new hypothesis, the last guess, before the public. It goes up like a rocket, fizzing and sparkling, to the admiration of the on-lookers, but soon grows dim, fades away, disappears, and disappoints.

No such charge as haste or want of care can be

attributed to the preparation and publication of this Study. Want of skill, want of knowledge, may be its vital, fatal defects. Had I known more, I should have escaped my errors; had I delayed publication longer, I might have been wiser, and not have printed my conclusions. But such as I have, after these long years of inquiry, I give, in the hope that my contribution to this branch of Biblical criticism will not be wholly in vain.

Before entering upon the examination of the subject in hand, however, it will be necessary to give an outline of the construction and contents of the work which we are to examine, that the course of our inquiry may be clearly understood. The Pentateuch is composed of a sketch of the lives of the three great ancestors of the Hebrew people,— Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Genesis xii.–l.,— preceded by a sketch of the creation and the flood, and genealogies of the descendants of Adam in the line of Abraham to him (Genesis i.–xi.); and followed, after an interval of centuries, with an account of the residence of the Hebrews in Egypt and their escape from bondage to Mount Sinai (Exodus i.–xix.). All this is historical, and, excepting what is in Exodus, relates to what transpired before the birth of Moses, and may have been the work of some other person, even after his death. Nor is it probable that what is contained in Exodus up to the twentieth chapter was written by him. Nor by any one else was it written at the time the events recorded took place, and *may* not have been written for a century or more afterward. Moses and all the other leaders were too busily engaged in rescuing the people from the Egyp-

tians, and providing for their wants and organizing them into some orderly body, to undertake any literary labors. The laws given and the ritual prescribed and the place of worship erected, and its furniture, and the priest's duties and garments, are described and recorded. (Exodus xx.— Numbers x., 10). This portion was written as the laws were given and as the events transpired, day by day, at Sinai. Whatever is written respecting their wanderings, till they arrived on the eastern bank of the Jordan (Numbers x., 11–xxxvi.), was written as the events took place, either by Moses or by his scribe, or by both. The closing addresses by Moses, and the amendments and additions to the laws contained in them, were written by Moses himself or under his direction, by his scribes (Deuteronomy i.–xxxi.). There is no conclusive internal evidence that he did not compose the song contained in the thirty-second chapter, and the blessings in the thirty-third; but some other hand of course gave the account of his death and burial in the thirty-fourth chapter. The whole Pentateuch, however, was written before any other books that have come down to us, as the style, the "archaic language," shows, and will be illustrated hereafter.

This inquiry respecting the origin and age of the Pentateuch may be pursued, if one pleases, as a purely literary one; for the Mosaic dispensation is not ours, nor is the Law our rule of life. Whatever may prove true in regard to the Pentateuch, our relations to God, to Christ, and to man, are unchanged. Whether the Law was of human or of divine origin, we are, as Christians, to obey Christ, and accept the "substance,"

of which the Law, at the best, was only a "shadow." As a purely literary inquiry, therefore, I shall discuss them.

Three distinct questions present themselves for consideration in opening our inquiry: Is the Pentateuch as old as the time of Moses? Is Moses its author? Does it contain a reliable account of the revelation which God made to the Jews? The first of these questions may be answered in the affirmative, and yet both the others be answered in the negative. The first two may be answered in the affirmative, and the last in the negative. The second may be answered in the negative, and the first and last in the affirmative. We can suppose Moses wrote the book and wrote incorrectly. We can suppose it to be of the Mosaic Age, and yet not written by him. We can suppose that, though not written by him, it contains the truth.

In this Study, I propose to examine and answer only the first question: Is the Pentateuch as *old* as the time of Moses? The inquiry will be divided into two parts: (1) *the historical indications of the existence of the book;* and (2) *the evidence to be derived from its internal character,*— or the external and internal evidence. I shall commence with the former.

PART I.

EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

In tracing the historical references to this work, we must have regard to the character of the writings in which the references are contained, and to the state of mind which the people were in to whom these writings were addressed. Where a people are well acquainted with a book, the references to it will be incidental rather than direct, implied rather than expressed. The Pentateuch, in the time of our Saviour, was so well known that it was not necessary to be definite in describing the book when references were made to it. The copy used, the page from which the quotation was taken, or to which reference was made, were not stated. The writer or speaker thought he had been sufficiently explicit if he had said "The Law" or "The Law of Moses" or "The Book of the Law." More frequently in that age, the Pentateuch was called only "The Law." Let us, then, trace back from this period, in which the Pentateuch was undeniably called "The Law" when reference was made to it, indications of its existence in still earlier periods. And if we find references made to "The Law" and to "The Book of the Law" and to "The Law of Moses" and to "The Law of the Lord," we are bound to infer, unless overpowering reasons to the contrary can be given, that the Pentateuch is the book referred to; and especially are we

bound to infer this, if *quotations* are made from the book referred to which are contained in the Pentateuch as we now have it, or as it existed at the time the quotations were made. These statements, if reduced to a canon of criticism, would give the following law of historical inquiry, which I believe to be correct; namely, *if we find that an ancient book is referred to, in all later works, by the name which is now given to it, and that references are made to it, and that quotations are made from its contents, such substantially as we now find in it, then the proper, the necessary conclusion is that the book is the same as that which we possess.*

This law of historical criticism I intend to apply to this inquiry respecting the antiquity of the Pentateuch in substantially the same form as that in which it existed in the time of Christ. I propose to go back, step by step, examining all the writings relating to the subject which have come down to our time, that we may learn whether they refer to the "Book of Moses," and, if so, in what manner. If we find such a book alluded to, named, quoted from, in the writings which have come down to us from the Jewish people, then the conclusion is that the book is at least as old as any of these writings, just as a traveller who has ascended the Nile from Alexandria to its outflow from a lake in central Africa would be sure he had found its source.

SECTION I. FROM CHRIST TO MALACHI.

I begin with the first Book of Esdras, which was probably written a short time before the birth of Christ. It speaks of the "Book of Moses," of "The Law of Moses," of "The Law of the Lord," and of "The

Law." That in the last instance a *book* is meant is clear from the rest of the passage: after Esdras had brought "The Law of Moses," "When he had *opened the Law*, they stood up" (ix., 46).

The first Book of Maccabees was written about one hundred years before Christ. "The Book of the Law" is spoken of (iii., 48), and "The Law" is very frequently alluded to in it. The Book of Ecclesiasticus was written about a century before the Book of Maccabees, according to the more probable opinion. In this, we find reference to "The Law which Moses commanded" (xxiv., 23), to "The Book of the Covenant of the Most High God," to "The Law of God," and to "The Law" very frequently. The translator of this book, who lived about seventy years later, speaks of "The Law," referring to the Pentateuch, five times in his short preface. One hundred years earlier than this book was written, the Septuagint translation was made; and, one hundred years before the Septuagint translation was made, the Samaritan Pentateuch was in existence. How much earlier than this it existed, I do not now attempt to decide. But that it existed as early as four hundred years before Christ there is no good reason to doubt. I have now gone back to the time of the Prophet Malachi. From his time down to the time of the son of Sirach, who composed the Book of Ecclesiasticus, we have probably no Jewish writings.

What they were accustomed to call the Pentateuch, when they referred to it by name, we cannot tell. It was in existence during this period we know; for the Septuagint translation was made, and the Samaritan Pentateuch was in existence. Back to the time of Mal-

achi, it is very easy to trace the use of the Pentateuch as it existed in the time of Christ. There can be no mistake respecting it.

SECTION II. FROM MALACHI TO EZRA.

Let us now examine the books which are extant which were written *after* the return from the captivity, or rather those which *give an account* of the nation after its return from the captivity to the time of Malachi; for I will omit a consideration of the testimony of the Books of Chronicles for the present. The prophecies of Malachi, Zechariah, and Haggai, and the histories contained in Ezra and Nehemiah, cover a period of about one hundred and fifty years, extending back to five hundred and thirty-two years before Christ. Malachi exhorts the people to "remember the Law of Moses." He accuses the priests of being "partial in the Law," and of causing many to stumble at "The Law," and tells them that the people should seek "The Law" at the mouth of the priest (iv., 4; ii., 7, 8, 9). Haggai is directed by the Lord to ask the "priest concerning the Law" (ii., 11). Zechariah accuses the people of making "their hearts as an adamant stone, lest they should hear the Law" (vii., 12). The particular sins of which these prophets reproach the people are violations of precepts contained in the Pentateuch, and the virtues which they approve are founded on obedience to the laws found in it.

But we find much more distinct reference to the Pentateuch in the Books of Nehemiah and Ezra than in these poetical books. In the eighth chapter of the Book of Nehemiah there is a very full account of "The Book of the Law of Moses." A summary may be given

in a few words, in which the various names by which this book was called may be included. The people spake to "Ezra the scribe to bring the Book of the Law of Moses, . . . and he brought the Law . . . and read therein, . . . and the ears of all the people were attentive unto the Book of the Law. . . . And Ezra opened the Book," and he appointed many others who "caused the people to understand the Law. . . . So they read in the Book of the Law of God distinctly. . . . And the people wept when they heard the words of the Law. . . . Also he read in the Book of the Law of God." In the tenth chapter, we read of "God's law given by the hand of Moses," and of that which "is written in the Law." In the thirteenth chapter, it is said, "They read in the Book of Moses." These passages show us most clearly that this book was called by different names, and that one of them was simply "The Law." The passages quoted in Nehemiah from "The Book of the Law" are found in the Pentateuch. Indeed, the Samaritan Pentateuch was nearly contemporaneous with Nehemiah, as some of the ablest critics contend, if it does not date back many years earlier, as is not improbable, to say the least of it.

The Book of Ezra, which contains a history of a still earlier period, is equally clear and explicit in its references to the Book of Moses. It is said that they "offered burnt-offering, as it is written in the Law of Moses" (iii., 2); that they "set the priests, . . . as it is written in the Book of Moses" (vi., 18). We read that Ezra was a "ready scribe in the Law of Moses," and that he "prepared his heart to seek the Law of the Lord" (vii., 6, 10). Strange wives are said to have been

put away, according to "The Law" (x., 3). This Ezra, a learned scribe in "The Law," is said, in the history which gives an account of his deeds, to have instructed the people in the Law, and to have established the worship as required by the Law. He is evidently fully honored in the book; but the greatest work which *tradition* attributes to him is not alluded to, not hinted at in the most remote manner. I refer to the work of recovering the Law, and putting in order its commands, after they had been lost during the captivity. Of this work, nothing is said, nothing is hinted. "The Book of the Law" is spoken of as something in existence, not as something which Ezra composed or compiled or found. Whatever may have been its origin, Ezra was not its author. And, should there be no evidence of its existence before the time of Ezra or before the captivity, it would still be true that we have not a shadow of historical evidence that Ezra was the author of the book, but, rather, most abundant evidence should we have to the contrary. The quotations which are made from this "Book of the Law" are taken from the Pentateuch as we now have it; and the historical proof is strong that he read to the people the book which has come down to us. So far, the historical notices of the book are all that could be expected under the circumstances. No work of so high antiquity has come down to us with so good evidence of its genuineness.

SECTION III. FROM THE CAPTIVITY TO DAVID.

A broader field now opens before us, and more difficult to traverse. Are there any traces of the existence of this book at an earlier period? Are there any refer-

ences to such a work in the earlier writings of the Jewish nation, or in writings of the period of Ezra which relate to the earlier times of the people? This is the question which is now to be answered.

Before proceeding to answer the question proposed, however, it is necessary to notice a few particulars touching the writings which have come down to us. They may be divided into two classes, the poetical and the historical. Respecting the latter class, little or nothing need be said by way of explanation. In poetical books, we do not expect such explicit references to books, especially to those which are familiar to us, as in prose compositions. How few references to the New Testament of such a nature as you will see in a librarian's catalogue, or a critic's treatise, will you find in all the poetical works in the English language! Even in our sacred poetry, no such specific titles of the New Testament are found. "God in the gospel of his Son" is, I think, the most specific reference in one of our hymn-books. And, even in sermons, it is not often that book and chapter and verse are referred to. It is sufficient for our purpose, if there is such a reference or allusion to the Gospels as enables us to perceive that such is the poet's or preacher's intent. So in the poetical books of the period preceding and during the captivity. All that we can expect to find, and all that we need to find, to prove the existence of the "Book of the Law," which Ezra read and taught, is such allusion to its contents and spirit, and such use of its words and phrases, as to show that it was in the poet's mind. If we demand more proof than this, we demand what, from the very nature of the case, we ought not to expect.

Respecting the historical books, it should be remembered that a period of probably one thousand years is covered by the Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, the whole contents of which would not make a volume larger than the fifth volume of Bancroft's *History of the United States*, which embraces a period of but three years. The Books of Chronicles cover a portion of the same period, beginning with David, and giving only brief genealogies of what preceded his time. Surely, if "The Law" was really a well-known book, we should expect to find but very few specific references to it in these writings. None, indeed, should we expect to find there, unless something very closely connected with the book itself should call for them. All that we can expect is such a reference to manners, customs, institutions, duties, as shall indicate an existing, fundamental law, such as was contained in Ezra's "Book of the Law," which he read to the people, and taught them to obey, as having been given by Moses in conformity to the divine command. More reference than this to the Pentateuch, I hesitate not to say, cannot be expected in these books. Were there more, I should not be surprised to find an argument, drawn from their very frequency, against the reliableness of the books themselves, such as is now drawn against the reliableness of Chronicles, because the writer has dwelt at greater length on ecclesiastical affairs than the writer of the Books of the Kings has seen fit to do. Let us bear in mind, then, as we proceed to examine these books, both poetical and historical, that we must not expect more, nor a different kind of, references to the "Book of the Law" than the circumstances of the

case authorize. On the supposition that the Pentateuch did exist as early as the time of David, we cannot expect reasonably any more evidence of the fact from these Jewish writings than I have before indicated.

I. *Evidences from the Historical Writings.*—In the first place, I will examine the *historical* writings which treat of the period before the captivity from the time of David; and, as some objection has been raised against the reliableness of the Books of the Chronicles, I will first examine the Books of the Kings. I will mention the passages in which "The Book of the Law" is referred to, and then I will quote those words and phrases which are evidently taken from that book. This division of the evidence seems necessary in order to bring out its force fully. I will then turn to the Books of the Chronicles, and inquire whether there is such an obvious prejudice in the writer's mind respecting this Book of the Law as to make void all his statements in regard to it.

In the Books of the Kings, we find the following references to the Pentateuch. In the time of Josiah, whose reign closed twenty-three years before the captivity, we read (II. Kings xxii.) that Hilkiah, the high priest, "found the Book of the Law in the house of the Lord," which was then undergoing repairs. When the king "heard the words of the Book of the Law, he rent his clothes"; for the people, both under the reign of his father and that of his grandfather for sixty years, had disregarded the Law utterly, having erected idols in the Temple for the people, and having endeavored by the utmost cruelties to exterminate the worship

of Jehovah. And in the twenty-third chapter we read that the king "read all the words of this covenant that were written in this book." And he "commanded all the people to keep the passover, as it is written in the book of this covenant." And he "turned to the Lord with all his soul and with all his might, according to all the Law of Moses."

It will be noticed that the same name is given to the book found by Hilkiah which was given to the book which Ezra used in instructing the people. Some difficulties, however, have been started respecting this transaction which demand a moment's notice. It has been asked significantly how it was possible for Josiah to be entirely ignorant of the contents of the Law of Moses. It has always appeared to me that the answer is very easy, when we consider the condition of the kingdom. Manasseh, the grandfather of Josiah, had reigned most wickedly for fifty-five years. He had introduced all the "abominations of the heathen," had "built altars in the house of the Lord," and had built "altars for all the host of heaven in the two courts of the house of the Lord." He also made his son pass through fire, and "dealt with familiar spirits and wizards," and "shed innocent blood very much, till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to the other." And Amon, his son, the father of Josiah, in his short reign of two years, "forsook the Lord and walked in all the way of his fathers." So that for fifty-seven years the Law had been utterly disregarded, and very probably all the copies of the Law on which the wicked kings could lay their hands had been destroyed. Josiah came to the throne when he was a mere child, only eight years of

age. When he had reigned eighteen years, as some maintain, or when he was eighteen years of age, and had reigned ten years, as others suppose, he appears to have learned something about the religion of the fathers, and to have commenced repairs on the Temple. The pious Jews would unquestionably try his disposition toward a change from idol worship; and, when it was found that he was disposed to return to the worship of his fathers, a copy of the Law was produced for his examination. It was very probably the Temple copy,— perhaps the autograph of Moses which had been hidden by the priests to keep it from the destroying hands of Manasseh. As Hilkiah expresses no surprise at finding the book, nor Shaphan at its contents, they probably had arranged this matter so as to put this venerable copy into the king's hands. Taking all these circumstances into the account, it is neither wonderful that Josiah was overwhelmed with grief when the book was read, nor that Hilkiah should have brought the book from its hiding-place at this time. It is possible, to take another view, namely, that, in removing the rubbish from the Temple, the lost Mosaic autograph copy of the Law, which was kept in the Temple for sacred purposes, may have been found. At all events, there is nothing in this account which indicates that the book was not in existence before this time, as some have maintained, but quite the contrary; for how could it have been found if it had not existed before the finding? De Wette admits that the book here found is the Pentateuch. These are his words: "The discovery of the Book of the Law in the Temple, under Josiah's reign, about 624 B.C., re-

lated in II. Kings xxii., is the first certain trace of the Pentateuch in its present form." That the Pentateuch was "in its present form" in the time of Josiah is sufficiently clear from the historical proof that we have adduced. Whether De Wette is correct or not in saying that it is the "first certain trace of it in its present form" will soon appear.*

In the reign of Hezekiah, who preceded Josiah about one hundred years, we read (II. Kings xvii., 13) that the kingdom of Israel had neglected the covenant "made with the fathers"; and they are exhorted to turn from their evil ways, and to walk "according to all the Law." In the thirty-fourth and thirty-seventh verses, it is stated that the people "fear not the Lord, neither do they after their statutes or after their ordinances or after the Law and commandment which the

* It has been objected to this account of the loss and recovery of the roll of the Law that it is so highly improbable as to render it incredible, and furnish evidence of its being a forgery. But the historical scholar will recall cases more wonderful than this. William Bradford s manuscript History of Plymouth Plantation was cited by Prince in 1736, and composed a part of his library deposited in the tower of the Old South Church, Boston, Mass. It was last cited by Governor Hutchinson in 1767. It was lost, though most diligent search was made for it for *eighty years*, when it was found accidentally in England by the Bishop of Oxford, in the Fulham Library, as he was searching for material for his History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America.

Bradford's Letter-Book MS. was also lost for many years. At last, a portion of it was accidentally found in a grocer's shop in Halifax, N.S., by James Clarke, Esq. These specimens of lost and recovered MSS. in modern times must suffice to show the perfect credibility of this account of Hilkiah. It will not be considered to the point probably to mention that Herculaneum and Pompeii were lost for over sixteen centuries in the heart of Italy. Most certainly, a Hebrew roll might be lost for sixty years in the ruined, desecrated Temple of Jerusalem.

Prof. W. Robertson Smith says, in his lectures on the Old Testament in the Jewish Church, p. 362, "The comparison of Deuteronomy xviii. with II. Kings xxxiii., *et seq.*, effectually disproves the idea of some critics that the Deuteronomic Code was a forgery of the Temple priests or of their head, the high priest Hilkiah."

Lord commanded the children of Jacob"; . . . with whom the Lord had made a covenant and charged them, saying, "Ye shall not fear other gods, nor bow yourselves to them, nor serve them (Exodus xx., 5). . . . But the statutes and the ordinances and the Law and the commandment which he wrote for you, ye shall observe, since the Lord brought you out of the land of Egypt." The reference here to *a book*, and the *same* book which Josiah found, is too clear to need comment. It is so minutely described as containing the "statutes" and "ordinances" and "commandments" that there seems to be no room for reasonable doubt about the identity of the books. If room for doubt is left by these passages, chapter xviii., 6, closes it: Hezekiah "clave to the Lord, and kept his commandments which the Lord commanded Moses."

In about 830 B.C., a hundred years before the reign of Hezekiah, we read (II. Kings xiv., 6) that Amaziah, King of Judah, "slew not the children of the murderers [who had slain his father], according unto that which is written in the *Book of the Law of Moses*, wherein the Lord commanded, saying, The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, nor the children be put to death for the fathers" (Deuteronomy xxiv., 16). Here the "Book" is distinctly spoken of as having been in existence in the time of Amaziah, two hundred years before the reign of Josiah. If it should be said that this is a remark of the historian derived from the opinions of his own time, the case is varied but little; for it would show that in this time the antiquity of the book was the common belief.

About fifty years earlier than this, when Jehoash was

anointed king, we read (II. Kings xi., 12) that a part of the ceremony of his coronation consisted in giving him "the testimony," or, as De Wette and Gesenius translate, "The Law." In Deuteronomy xvii., 18, 19, it is required of the king that he should have "a copy of the Law," . . . "to read therein all the days of his life." It is also recorded of Jehu, who reigned over Israel but a few years earlier, that he "took no heed to walk in the Law of the Lord God of Israel" (II. Kings x., 31). When the days drew nigh that David should die, he called Solomon to him, and charged him most solemnly to walk in the ways of the Lord, "to keep his statutes and his commandments and his judgments and his testimonies, as it is written in the Law of Moses" (I. Kings ii., 3).

Such are the explicit references in the Books of the Kings to the Law of Moses. The references are made to one book, the same as that which Josiah had, and from which Ezra taught. In about sixty pages of the copy of the Bible before me, containing a civil history of five hundred years, could more specific references to the Pentateuch have been expected? So brief, so limited, is the history that but few facts of any kind could be stated: much less could there be a continual, specific reference by name to a book which was so well known as that which contained the fundamental law of the nation must necessarily have been.

The last remark suggests another argument in favor of the existence of the book during the period of the Kings. It is that the sins rebuked are violations of the Mosaic Law, that the blessings promised are conditional upon obedience to that law. The whole tone

of the history is taken from the Pentateuch. I will enter into a more minute examination of this phenomenon, that the force of the argument derived from it may be more fully appreciated. This is the second division of the evidence to be derived from the Books of the Kings which I proposed to examine. If we discover that a writer is *borrowing words and phrases* which we find in a book to which he sometimes refers by the usual title, we are still more confirmed in the belief that he had before him the identical book which has come into our hands; just as, when we find the *phraseology* of the New Testament in the sermon or history which we are reading, we feel assured that the author had a copy of that book substantially like our own. I have already, in the examination of the Books of the Kings, made one or two quotations which contain passages from the Pentateuch. *I will now proceed to show that there is a Mosaic phraseology, an introduction and use of religious terms and antique expressions which indicate familiarity with the Books of Moses;* as the phrases, "was let hitherto," "thorn in the flesh," "given to hospitality," indicate familiarity with the language of the New Testament.

In I. Kings ii., 3, Solomon is directed to keep the Law, that "he may prosper in all that he does,"—a verbal quotation from Deuteronomy xxix., 9, except the change of person from plural to singular, to adapt it to the person addressed. In the prayer which Solomon delivered at the dedication of the Temple, there are numerous words and phrases taken from the Pentateuch, such as, "if any man trespass against his neighbor," "blasting and mildew," "the people of

thine inheritance," "the Lord is God, there is none else." And if we consider that, in connection with the use of these phrases, Solomon makes use of thes expressions, "*as thou spakest by the hand of Moses thy servant*, when thou broughtest our fathers out of the land of Egypt," "there hath not failed one word of all his good promise *which he promised by the hand of Moses his servant*," we cannot but feel a strong assurance, not to say certainty, that we have the book which contained those promises. In chapter xxi., 3, Naboth says to Ahab, who had proposed that Naboth should give him his vineyard, "The Lord forbid it me that I should give the inheritance of my fathers unto thee." The "inheritance of the fathers" was inalienable according to the Law, and was considered very precious, as may be seen by referring to Numbers xxxvi. In chapter xxii., 11, Zedekiah, a false prophet, who had "made him horns of iron," declared to Ahab, "With these shalt thou push the Syrians," referring directly to Deuteronomy xxxiii., 17, where it is said of Joseph, "His horns are like the horns of unicorns; with them shall he push the people together to the ends of the earth." In the seventeenth verse of the same chapter, it is said, "I saw all Israel . . . as sheep that have not a shepherd." This phrase is taken from Numbers xxvii., 17: "That the congregation of the Lord be not as sheep which have no shepherd." The agreement in the Hebrew is verbal. In the twenty-seventh verse, a prophet is sentenced by the king to eat the "bread of affliction," a phrase taken from Deuteronomy xvi., 3, where the poor bread which the people were compelled to eat on their departure from Egypt is so called. In II. Kings ii., 9, Elisha

prays Elijah, "Let a double portion of thy spirit rest on me." This phrase, "double portion," is taken from Deuteronomy xxi., 17, where the portion of the "first-born" is described and defined. The use of the word *phé* in the sense of "portion" is found but three times in the Old Testament. In chapter iii., 19, 20, we find Elisha directing the king, when he made war upon the Moabites, to "fell every good tree," which is an allusion to Deuteronomy xx., 19, 20. In chapter iv., 16, we find a very peculiar expression relating to the birth of a child which is also found in Genesis xviii., 10, 14, where Sarah is assured that she shall have a son. The similarity of the two cases in some of their circumstances no doubt prompted the use of the peculiar phrase in Kings, "About this season, according to the time of life, thou shalt embrace a son." In the forty-second verse of this chapter, we read that a man brought to Elisha "bread of the first-fruits, twenty loaves of barley, and full ears of corn" (*carmel*). This word is used to denote the "polenta of early grain in Leviticus ii., 14; xxiii., 14," says Gesenius. In chapter v., 27, we read that the servant of Elisha went out from his presence "a leper white as snow." This peculiar phrase is used in Numbers xii., 10; Exodus iv., 6; and nowhere else. The phrase as used in those passages under such peculiar circumstances is very strongly marked, and is used by the writer in Kings to indicate the severity of the punishment which fell upon the servant of Elisha. A peculiar word is used in Genesis xix., 11, to indicate blindness: "They smote the men that were at the door with blindness." This Hebrew word is used in II. Kings vi., 18: "Smite, I pray thee, this people

with blindness." Elisha doubtless had in his mind the peculiar word which indicated the blindness with which the rioters about Lot's house had been smitten. The word is used in only these two instances. In chapter vii., 2, an unbeliever is represented as addressing Elisha thus: "If the Lord would make windows in heaven, might this thing be?" In Genesis vii., 11, "the windows of heaven" are spoken of as having been opened to produce the devastating flood. So here the speaker says that, when a flood comes again, this which you have predicted may happen. So references in the Prophets are made to the same event in this peculiar phrase (Isaiah xxiv., 18; Malachi iii., 10), which is used nowhere else.

Such is a specimen of the peculiar words which are used in the Books of the Kings, taken from the Pentateuch. But we also find in these books statements respecting the observance of ordinances required in the Pentateuch. In I. Kings xviii., 29, 36, we read of the "time of offering the evening sacrifice," as required in Exodus xxix., 39; and in II. Kings iii., 20, we read that aid was afforded "in the morning when the meat offering was offered." Compare this with the same passage in Exodus, and we shall find that offerings were required morning and evening, and that a meat (or meal) offering was to be offered with the lamb. In II. Kings iv., 23, we read of two festal days, "the new moon" and "the Sabbath." And, in the first verse of the same chapter, we read of a creditor of whom a woman says, he "is come to take unto him my two sons to be bondmen." This the Law (Leviticus xxv., 39) permitted and regulated. Solomon is represented as "offering

burnt-offerings and peace-offerings," both of which were required by the Law. He also assembled all the people "at the feast in the month Ethanim, which is the seventh month." This was the feast of the tabernacle, and the Temple was dedicated at this time. On account of the joyfulness of the occasion, Solomon doubled the days of this most joyful of all the feasts. In I. Kings xii., 32, after the division of the kingdom, we read that Jeroboam "ordained a feast in the eighth month, on the fifteenth day of the month, like unto the feast that is in Judah, . . . in a month which he had devised of his own heart." Well did the historian say this, for the Law required the feast to be in the seventh month, not in the eighth.

The testimony rendered in the Books of the Kings — by the name of the book, by the use of its peculiar terms, by the quotations made from its contents, by the description of observances, sacrifices, feasts, offerings, such as the Law requires — to the existence of "the Book of the Law of Moses" which Ezra used in teaching the people is as full and as specific as, under the circumstances, we could expect. Had we no other writings of this period, the proof of the existence of the Pentateuch would be as great as that which is furnished for the antiquity of any other work of that age. But there are other writings. The Books of the Chronicles are still to be examined.

The writer of these Books of the Chronicles speaks more of ecclesiastical affairs, and hence we would expect to find in his writings more frequent reference to the rites and ceremonies of their religion. De Wette, Kuenen especially, and others, have decried these books

because they have what they call a Levitical spirit. I am not sure that a priestly spirit is more likely to bias an historian than a political spirit. There has been no evidence brought that the bias of the writer has corrupted his integrity. At all events, I am sure that the reader, after comparing what the chronicler has recorded respecting the Law with what is said respecting it in the Books of the Kings, will not be disposed to think that his Levitical bias has done him serious harm as an historian. Let us, then, see what this writer, who has been so unceremoniously treated, has to say of the Law, and the customs of the people so far as they regarded the Law.

In I. Chronicles xvi., 40, we read that Zadok the priest did "according to all that is written in the Law of the Lord, which he commanded Israel." In chapter xxii., 12, 13, David charges Solomon to "keep the Law of the Lord," and to "take heed to fulfil the statutes and judgments which the Lord charged Moses with concerning Israel." In II. Chronicles vi., 16, Solomon prays that God's promise to his father, founded on this condition,—if "thy children take heed to walk in my Law,"— may be fulfilled in him. This passage has been quoted before, from Kings. In chapter xii., 1, Rehoboam is said to have forsaken "the Law of the Lord." In chapter xiv., 4, Judah is commanded "to do the Law." In chapter xvii. is an account of the good king Jehoshaphat's sending out teachers to instruct the people; and "*they took the Book of the Law of the Lord with them*, and went about throughout all the cities of Judah, and taught the people." In chapter xxiii., 18, it is said that Jehoiada appointed persons who should

"offer the burnt-offerings of the Lord, *as it is written in the Law of Moses.*" In chapter xxv., 4, we read that Amaziah slew not the children of his father's murderers, "but did as it is written in *the Law of the Book of Moses*, where the Lord commanded, saying, "The fathers shall not die for the children, neither shall the children die for the fathers, but every man shall die for his own sin." This passage is quoted from Deuteronomy xxiv., 16. The parallel passage is II. Kings xiv., 6. In chapter xxx., 16, we read that the priests and Levites stood in their "place, . . . according to the Law of Moses." In the thirty-first chapter, Hezekiah directs that "morning and evening burnt-offerings, and the burnt-offerings for the Sabbaths, and for the new moons, and for the set feasts" shall be offered, "as it is written in the Law of the Lord." He further directed that "the portion of the priests and Levites" should be given them, "that they might be encouraged in the Law of the Lord." And "every work that he began . . . in the Law . . . he did with all his heart." In chapter xxxiii., 8, we read of "the whole Law and statutes and ordinances *by the hand of Moses.*" In chapter xxxiv., we have an account of the finding of the "Book of the Law of the Lord given by Moses," parallel to the passage in II. Kings xxii. In chapter xxxv., Josiah commands to kill the passover "according to the word of the Lord by the hand of Moses"; and they did "*as it is written in the Book of Moses.*" And the good king's acts were "according to that which was written in the Law of the Lord." It will be observed that the "Book of Moses" and "the Law of the Lord" are identical.

Such is the manner in which the Pentateuch is spoken

of in the Books of the Chronicles. There is no marked difference between the style of reference and that in the Kings. Nor are the references much more numerous. These *titles* of the book, or the *names* by which it is called, are the same as those which we found in the Books of the Kings, in Ezra, in Nehemiah, in Malachi, in Ecclesiasticus, and in Maccabees. The same names being used, the inference is that the same book is referred to. But as we found quotations from the book in Kings, so we do in the Chronicles, still more certainly identifying it as the same book by its contents. The use of peculiar and emphatic terms which are found in the Pentateuch shows that the writer was familiar with the book as we now have it. The people are exhorted not to be "stiff-necked" as their fathers were,—II. Chronicles xxx., 8. In the Pentateuch, this is a favorite term. "The mighty hand and stretched-out arm" are spoken of in chapter vi., 32, which is a peculiar phrase of the Pentateuch. God is said to be "gracious and merciful," chapter xxx., 9, which is a quotation from Exodus xxxiv., 6. It is used elsewhere in the Pentateuch, however. In chapter xxx., 15, we read that "they killed the passover on the fourteenth day of the second month"; and "kept the feast of unleavened bread seven days," verse 21. This is in accordance with what is recorded in Exodus xii. The feasts are spoken of. In chapter viii., 13, we read of the solemn feasts, three times a year, "even the feast of unleavened bread, and the feast of weeks, and the feast of tabernacles." And in these books, as in the Books of the Kings, the whole tone of rebuke and approbation is taken from the standard established in the Pentateuch.

Nothing could be expected different in their style and tone, if it were mathematically certain that the Pentateuch existed at this time, by information derived from an entirely different source.

I have now examined the historical works which treat of the condition of the people from the time of David. It is for the reader to determine whether there is not as much and as explicit reference to the Pentateuch as, under the circumstances, could be expected. What book of that age can be so certainly traced in history? We have found no hint of any remodelling of the work, and we have no historical reason to suppose that any such thing was done. Without any farther evidence, we have sufficient proof of the existence of the Pentateuch in the days of David, within three or four centuries of the time of Moses. But the whole field of the poetical books is yet to be explored. Further and striking evidence will here appear of the antiquity of the "Law of Moses, the man of God."

II. *Evidence from the Poetical Books.*—I have already remarked that in poetical works we do not expect to find books referred to by quoting their title-page; and usually we may expect that the reference will be the less explicit as the work referred to is well known. We shall only look for general terms and phrases, and shall often expect to find some word expressive of the contents of the book used by metonymy to denote the book itself. In the historical books, we have found that the Pentateuch was referred to by the name of "The Law," "The Law of Moses," "The Law of the Lord," "The statutes, judgments,

commandments, and ordinances of the Lord." We may therefore expect to find only these, and still more general, names given to the book by the poets.

1. The Book of Daniel is supposed by many to have been written at a late period, long after the captivity. As I do not propose to enter into any discussion respecting the age of the books which I shall quote, I will only remark that, if Daniel was written at as late a period as is maintained by some, it shows how the Pentateuch was referred to at that time, and enables us to trace the book, by the manner in which it is spoken of, back to earlier times. In Daniel ix., 10, 11, 13, we find the prophet lamenting, in his prayer, the sins of the people; and he confesses as follows: "Neither have we obeyed the voice of the Lord our God to walk in his laws. . . . Yea, all Israel have transgressed thy Law; . . . and therefore the curse is poured upon us. . . that is written in the Law of Moses, the servant of God. . . . And he hath confirmed his words, . . . as it is written in the Law of Moses." That the Pentateuch is here referred to is past all question.

2. Habakkuk, speaking of the violence that prevailed in the land, gives, as a reason for it, that "the Law is slacked, and judgment doth never go forth," chapter i., 4.

3. Zephaniah, chapter ii., 3, exhorts all those "to seek the Lord which have wrought his judgment," *i.e.*, obeyed his Law; for we shall soon find that this word sometimes stands for the whole Law.

4. Ezekiel, who lived during the captivity, prophesying of the evil yet to befall the people, says, chapter vii., 26, "The Law shall perish from the priests." In

the name of God, he says to the people, chapter v., 6, "they have refused my judgments and my statutes, and have not walked in them." He declares, chapter xi., 20, that their heart will yet become flesh, so that they will walk in "the statutes and keep the ordinances" of the Lord. He repeats the same truth in chapter xxxvi., 27. In the eighteenth chapter, the same expressions are used to denote the Law; and specific statutes are referred to. He promises that blessings shall attend the man who "hath not defiled his neighbor's wife" (Leviticus xviii., 20); nor hath come near to a woman when she is ritually unclean,—a technical term (Leviticus xviii., 19); nor hath "oppressed any" (Leviticus xxv., 14); "but hath restored to the debtor his pledge" (Exodus xxii., 26); "hath spoiled none by violence" (Leviticus vi., 2); "hath given his bread to the needy, and hath covered the naked with a garment" (Deuteronomy xv., 7, 8); that "hath not given forth upon usury" (Exodus xxii., 25); that "hath executed true judgment between man and man" (Leviticus xix., 15). In chapter xi., 12, Ezekiel gives as a reason why so great punishments should fall upon these people that they "have not walked in the statutes nor executed the judgments" of the Lord, but have done after the manner of the heathen. If we look into the Law (Leviticus xviii., 4, 5), we shall find it declared that the people shall not do according to other people's laws and customs; and it is commanded them, "Ye shall keep my statutes and my judgments." These references will suffice for this prophet, to show that he quotes the Law, and that he gives it the same

names, in his references to it, which are given by other writers whose works we have examined.*

5. From Ezekiel, I will pass to Jeremiah, who was his contemporary for a part of his life. Jeremiah went from Jerusalem into Egypt. Ezekiel, many years previ-

* "It is difficult," says a writer in *The Unitarian Review* for November, 1880, p. 431, "it is difficult to read his [Ezekiel's] pages written in Babylon, and believe that any important priestly legislation had preceded them. He does not quote from existing laws." In view of this unqualified denial from so respectable a source, I feel called upon to invite the reader's attention to farther proof that Ezekiel's writings give *overwhelming* evidence of his acquaintance with "existing laws." It is assumed from the character of the writer that no quibble is intended in the use of the word "quote." If it is meant that the name of the writer, and the chapter and verse in which the quotation may be found, are not mentioned, then there is an instant end to the discussion. But, if it is meant that there are no clear quotations of statutes and phrases from the Pentateuch as definitely made as could be expected in a poetical address, then I must take direct issue, and appeal to the judgment of the reader by fortifying my previous references; and the reader is especially requested to observe that the captivity of the people is ascribed to disobeying the law quoted.

Examples: Ezekiel iv., 14, "Behold, my soul hath not been polluted; for I have not eaten of that which dieth of itself, or is torn in pieces; neither came there abominable flesh into my mouth." Compare now the different laws on this subject: Exodus xxii., 31, "Neither shall ye eat any flesh that is torn of beasts"; Leviticus xvii., 15, "And he shall be unclean until the even"; Deuteronomy xiv, 3, "Thou shalt not eat any abominable thing"; and Leviticus xxii., 8, "That which dieth of itself, or is torn, he shall not eat." These scattered laws are condensed by Ezekiel. Ezekiel iv., 16, reads, "I will break the staff of bread in Jerusalem; and they shall eat bread by weight, and with care"; Leviticus xxvi, 26, "When I have broken the staff of your bread, . . . they shall deliver you your bread by weight"; Ezekiel v., 10, "The fathers shall eat the sons in the midst of thee, and the sons shall eat their fathers, . . . and the whole remnant of thee will I scatter into all the winds." Compare Leviticus xxvi., 29, "And ye shall eat the flesh of your sons, and the flesh of your daughters"; and verse 33, "And I will scatter you among the heathen"; also Deuteronomy xxviii., 64, "The Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other." This is another instance of Ezekiel's condensing separate threatenings into one. Ezekiel v., 12, "I will scatter a third part into all the winds, and I will draw out a sword after them"; Leviticus xxvi., 33, "I will scatter you among the heathen, and will draw out a sword after you"; Ezekiel xiv., 14, 15, "I will make thee waste, and a reproach among the nations. . . . It shall be a reproach and a taunt, an instruction and an astonishment unto the nations"; Leviticus xxvi., 31, "I will make your cities waste, and bring your sanctuaries unto desolation, . . . and your ene-

ously, went to Babylonia as a captive. The following remarkable quotation from the Pentateuch is found in Jeremiah iv., 23, "I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was *without form and void*," a phrase found only in Genesis i., 2. In chapter ii., 8, the prophet says, in the

mies . . . shall be astonished at it." So Deuteronomy xxviii., 37, "Thou shalt become an astonishment, a proverb, and a by-word among all nations"; Ezekiel v., 17, "I will send upon you famine, and evil beasts, and they shall bereave thee"; Leviticus xxvi., 22, "I will also send wild beasts among you, which shall rob you of your children"; Ezekiel vi., 4, 5, "I will destroy your high places, your altars shall be desolate and your images shall be broken, and I will cast down your slain before your idols, and I will lay the dead carcasses of the children of Israel before their idols"; Leviticus xxvi., 30, "I will destroy your high places and cut down your images, and cast your carcasses upon the carcasses of your idols"; Ezekiel vi., 6, "The cities shall be laid waste, and the high places shall be desolate"; Leviticus xxvi., 31, "I will make your cities waste, and bring your sanctuaries unto desolation"; Ezekiel xiv., 8, "I will set my face against that man, . . . and will cut him off from the midst of my people"; Leviticus xvii., 10, "I will set my face against that soul, . . . and will cut him off from among his people"; Ezekiel xiv., 15, "Wild beasts will desolate the land." So Leviticus xxvi., 22; Ezekiel xvi., 59, "Thou hast despised the oath in breaking the covenant"; Deuteronomy xxix., 12, "That thou shouldest enter into covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his oath"; verse 14, "Neither with you only do I make this covenant and this oath"; Ezekiel xviii., 6. There is a special reference to the law respecting the relation of the sexes, which is found in Leviticus xviii., 19, 20, and xxiv., 18; Ezekiel xviii., 7, "And hath not oppressed any, but hath restored to the debtor his pledge"; Exodus xxii., 26, "If thou take thy neighbor's raiment to pledge, thou shalt deliver it to him by that the sun goeth down"; xxiii., 9, "Thou shalt not oppress a stranger"; Ezekiel xviii., 20, "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son"; Deuteronomy xxiv., 16, "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers"; Ezekiel xx., 6, "a land flowing with milk and honey"; Exodus iii., 8, "a good land, . . . a land flowing with milk and honey"; Ezekiel xx., 11, "And I gave them my statutes, and showed them my judgments, which if a man do he shall live in them"; Leviticus xviii., 5, "Ye shall keep my statutes and my judgments, which if a man do he shall live in them"; Ezekiel xx., 12, "I gave them my sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them"; Exodus xxxi., 13, "My sabbaths ye shall keep, for it is a sign between me and you"; Ezekiel xx., 13, "Then I said, I would pour out my fury upon them in the wilderness, to consume them"; Numbers xiv., 29, 32, 33, "So will I do to you: your carcasses shall fall in this wilderness"; Ezekiel xx., 23, "I lifted up my hand unto them also in the wilderness, that I would scatter them among the heathen, and

name of the Lord, "They that handle the Law knew me not"; for the priests and the prophets whose office it was to know the Law were both of them violating it by serving Baal. In chapter xviii., 8, the prophet complains, in a prayer to the Lord, of the boasting of

disperse them through the countries." The threatening is recorded in Leviticus xxvi., 33, "I will scatter you among the heathen"; Ezekiel xx., 31, "When ye offer your gifts, when ye make your sons to pass through the fire"; Leviticus xviii., 21, "Thou shalt not let any of thy seed pass through the fire to Molech." This chapter is largely the language of the Levitical law: Ezekiel xxii., 7, "They have set light by father and mother"; Deuteronomy xxvii., 16, "Cursed be he that setteth light by his father or his mother"; also, "They have dealt oppression with the stranger"; Exodus xxii., 21, "Thou shalt neither vex a stranger, nor oppress him"; also, "In thee have they vexed the fatherless and the widow"; Exodus xxii., 22, "Ye shall not afflict any widow or fatherless child." In Ezekiel xxii., the language and phrases and sentences of the Pentateuch are so frequent as to forbid quotation. After one more quotation, I must refer the interested reader to the chapter itself. Verse 26 reads thus: "Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they showed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my sabbaths, and I am profaned among them"; Leviticus xxii., 2, "Speak unto Aaron and to his sons, . . . that they profane not my holy name in those things which they hallow unto me"; x., 10, "And that ye put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean." Here is certainly a clear reference to priests, to a ritual law, and the duty of observing it. There are not less than twenty distinct references to the law and passages from it in this chapter of only thirty-one verses.

It would seem to most minds a sheer waste of time and patience to pursue this inquiry further, but one or two more passages demand attention: Ezekiel xxiv., 7, "Her blood, . . . she poured it not upon the ground to cover it with dust"; Leviticus xvii., 13, "He shall even pour out the blood thereof, and cover it with dust." In Deuteronomy xii., 16, it reads, "Ye shall pour out the blood upon the earth as water," and nothing is said of "covering it with dust," showing that Ezekiel had the priestly law of Leviticus before him, or in mind, which, according to Kuenen's hypothesis, was not written till a century after his death! If the reader has interest enough to do it, and is not yet satisfied, he may compare Ezekiel xxviii., 24, with Numbers xxxiii., 55; and Ezekiel xxxiii., 15, with Exodus xxii., 4, Numbers v., 6, Leviticus xviii., 5; and Ezekiel xxxiii., 25, with Leviticus vii., 26; Ezekiel xxxiv., 25–27, with Leviticus xxvi., 6, 7; Ezekiel xxxvi., 3, 17, with Deuteronomy xxviii., 37, Leviticus xviii., 25; and Ezekiel xxxix., 23, with Deuteronomy xxxi., 17. But enough: I must hold my hand.

I have taken pains to compare the frequency of Ezekiel's use of the language

the wicked, who say, "The Law shall not perish from the priest." In chapter xliv., 23, he upbraids the people because they have not "obeyed the voice of the Lord, nor walked in his Law, nor in his statutes, nor in his testimonies." And in the tenth verse he is still more explicit: speaking in the name of the Lord, he says, "Ye have not walked in my Law, nor in my statutes that I set before you and before *your fathers*." In the twenty-second verse, he says that on account of their sins their "land is a desolation and an astonishment and a curse,"—words used in Leviticus xxvi., 32, to denote the punishment which should follow transgression. These are a specimen of the terms used by this prophet when he refers to the Pentateuch. The whole spirit and almost letter of Jeremiah's prophesy is based upon the Pentateuch. His promises and threatenings are all founded upon the laws therein contained. All the rites and ceremonies which he describes are such as are found in "The Law." There is but one passage which appears to invalidate this

in the law, and references to it and quotations from it, with that of four of our most celebrated preachers' reference to the gospel, or quotations from it. Dr. Dewey, in the *Two Great Commandments*, a volume of three hundred pages, uses the language of the Gospels (texts of sermons excepted) but *forty-five* times. Mr. Martineau, in *Hours of Thought* second series, uses the language of the Gospels *twenty-five* times. Dr. Channing, in the *Perfect Life*, uses the language of the Gospels *eight* times in two hundred pages. Dr. Walker, in *Reason, Faith, and Duty*, uses the language of the Gospels *eighteen* times in two hundred pages; and in but *two* instances does he say he takes it from the Gospels, and in but very few instances do the others.

Since this note was written, I learn (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1881, p. 390) that Prof. R. Smend, in his recent work, *The Prophet Ezekiel* (*Der Prophet Ezechiel*), 1880, maintains that the Levitical law was developed from Ezekiel, and not Ezekiel's quotations taken from the law. Of any such hypothesis, the reading of Ezekiel is the swiftest and most conclusive confutation. Ezekiel's quotations are not only from a law *already* in existence, but from a law *given to the fathers*, and for *not obeying which* they were carried captive.

conclusion. It is contained in chapter vii., 21–23: "Put your burnt-offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat flesh. For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices. But this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people." The state of mind in which the prophet uttered this passage must be considered, in order to understand his meaning. "The children gather wood," says he, "and the fathers kindle the fire, and the women knead their dough to make cakes to the queen of heaven, and to pour out drink-offerings unto other gods," in the streets of Jerusalem. The flagrant violation of the Law in offering these sacrifices to such vile gods in the streets of the city so fired his soul with indignation that he put the comparative value of sacrifices and an obedient heart in direct contrast with each other: "The Lord did not command sacrifices; he required a pure heart." Another view is that the prophet here made a sharp distinction between what was commanded and what was only regulated. It is contended by some critics that sacrifices are regulated by the Law, not commanded by it,—they were already in existence, like circumcision.* Whatever view we may take of the prophet's meaning, we cannot understand him as looking upon sacrifices as offensive to God; for in chapter xvii., 26, in describing the great glory and pure worship of the blessed period which would come after their enemies were destroyed and God's kingdom

*Leviticus i., 2., "Speak unto the children of Israel and say unto them, *if* any man bring an offering unto the LORD, ye shall bring," etc.

was established, he says, "They shall come from the cities of Judah, and from the places about Jerusalem, and from the land of Benjamin, and from the plain, and from the mountains, and from the south, bringing burnt-offerings and sacrifices and meat-offerings and incense, and bringing sacrifices of praise unto the house of the Lord." The more probable interpretation is that which is founded upon the supposition that the prophet is asserting a strong negative to show the comparative value of sacrifices and the spirit in which they should be offered. But, admitting that we could adopt no interpretation which would reconcile this passage with others, it would not be reasonable to deny the assertion of a hundred passages because of the apparent counter assertion of one. His prophecy teaches most clearly that offering sacrifices in accordance with the regulations of the Pentateuch was a part of the national worship, and shows, whatever was the origin of that book, that it was in existence in his time. This, indeed, is the only point which I am now endeavoring to establish. In Lamentations, it is said, chap. ii., 9, that "the Law is no more"; that is, not regarded.

6. Passing now to a still earlier period, we come to Isaiah who flourished about 730 B.C. The style of his poetry is much loftier than that of the prophets whom we have examined, and hence we should expect to find fewer explicit references to the statute-book of the nation. I do not speak too strongly, however, when I say that the prophecies of Isaiah are based upon the doctrines of the Pentateuch. Their tone and spirit are just as we should expect them to be, if Isaiah had made himself familiar with that book. In describ-

ing the future glory of the kingdom, in a passage taken from a still earlier prophet, he says, "For out of Zion shall go forth *the Law*," to be established among all nations. In the eighth chapter, he rebukes the people for going after false gods, "and to wizards that peep and mutter"; and asks, "Should not a people seek unto their own God? . . . To *the Law* and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Nothing can be clearer than that the prophet counsels the people to study the book of their own law instead of consulting wizards, if they wish to learn their duty. In chapter xlii., 21, 24, the prophet declares that, notwithstanding the neglect which it has received, the Lord "will magnify the Law and make it honorable"; and he gives as a reason why Jacob had been given for a spoil and Israel to robbers, that they "would not walk in the ways of the Lord, neither were obedient to his Law." Gesenius says that the phrase, "I will make my judgment to rest for a light of the people" (chap. li., 4), refers to the Mosaic Law. It should be remarked concerning the last two passages that they are in that portion of Isaiah which has been assigned to a later date and another writer. In chapter xxiv., 5, it is affirmed that the people "have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, and broken the everlasting covenant." By these terms "The Law" is referred to in other books, and very probably they refer to it here. In the first chapter of his prophecy, Isaiah rebukes severely those who "trample the courts of the Lord," bringing their sacrifice with wicked hearts and bloody hands. He says to the people, if "ye be willing and obedient, ye

shall eat of the good of the land." This is in conformity with the Law, Deuteronomy iv., 30; viii., 20; and many other places. He speaks of their "new moons" and "appointed feasts." He asks where the people can be "smitten" again, since "from the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it," with evident reference to Deuteronomy xxviii., 35, where it is said of the nation, if it sin, "The Lord shall smite thee . . . with a sore botch that cannot be healed, from the sole of thy foot to the top of thy head." He says to them, "Your country is desolate; your cities are burned with fire; your land — strangers devour it, and it is desolate," as it was foretold would be the case in Deuteronomy xxviii., where it is said, "The nation from far . . . shall eat the fruit of thy land" until it be "destroyed." "But," he continues, "if ye be willing and be obedient, ye shall consume the good of the land; but, if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." In Leviticus xxvi., 5, the Lord says, "If ye walk in my statutes, . . . ye shall eat your bread to the full"; but, if ye will not hearken to me, I "will draw out a sword after you" (verse 33); "my sword shall devour flesh" (Deuteronomy xxxii., 42). In the description which the prophet gives of the enemy which he will call to destroy his wicked people, there is evident allusion to Deuteronomy xxviii., 49, 50. Isaiah says (chap. v., 26, 27), "He will lift up an ensign to the nations from far, and will hiss them from the end of the earth. . . . They shall come with speed swiftly." In Deuteronomy, referred to above, Moses says, "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of

the earth, as swift as an eagle flieth." These specimens must suffice to show how Isaiah's style abounds with words and phrases which are taken from the Pentateuch. They prove that the style of the old Law Book and its very words were imbedded in his mind so as to make a part of his thoughts.

7. The prophet Micah was a contemporary of Isaiah. His short prophecy is based, in all its rebukes and promises, upon the laws and threatenings and promises made in the Pentateuch. In the closing verse of his prophecy, he declares that faithfulness and mercy will yet visit the people, "which," he says, addressing the Lord, "thou hast sworn unto our fathers from the days of old." These promises will be found in Genesis xii., 2; xxvi., 24; xxviii., 13; Deuteronomy xxx., 1–5. I will not pause to examine minutely this prophecy. It exhibits the same characteristics as does that of Isaiah; and, as he was contemporary with that prophet, it is less important to present his allusions, mostly quite obscure, to the Law. And I pass on the more readily, since Dr. Kuenen, in his elaborate work on *The Religion of Israel*, admits that the references of Micah are so numerous and so exact to the events recorded in the Pentateuch that "we must even suppose that he was acquainted with those narratives, unless appearances should tend to show that they were written or modified at a later date" (Vol. I., p. 103). I will therefore proceed to a consideration of the prophecies of Hosea, Amos, and Joel, taking them up in order.

8. Hosea (780 B.C.) says to the people (chap. iv., 6), "Thou hast forgotten the Law of thy God." Again, he says (chap. viii., 1), "They have transgressed my

covenant and trespassed against my Law," therefore "He shall come as an eagle against the house of the Lord." The reference is to Deuteronomy xxviii., 49, "The Lord shall bring a nation . . . as swift as an eagle flieth." Speaking of Ephraim, in the name of the Lord, he says (viii., 12), "I have written to him the great things of my Law, but they were counted as a strange thing." One of the distinguishing features of the style of this book is the repeated use of the words "whore," "whoring," "whoredom," to signify desertion of the true God and worship of false gods. This phraseology is derived from the Pentateuch most obviously. In Exodus xxxiv., 15, 16; Leviticus xx., 5, 6; Numbers xiv., 33; Deuteronomy xxxi., 16, and in numerous other places, these words are used to signify idolatry. Indeed, the style of Hosea is colored *through and through* with the style of the Books of Moses. I will commence with the first chapter and proceed with an examination of his style as far as is necessary for my purpose. The land is said (chap. i., 2) to have "committed a great whoredom." Leviticus xix., 29, "Lest the land fall to ["commit"; the original word is the same as in Hosea] whoredom." In verse 10, it is said, "The number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered," which is a verbal quotation from the promise made to Jacob (Genesis xxxii., 12), "I will make thy seed as the sand of the sea, which cannot be numbered for multitude." In the eleventh verse, the prophet says that the people "shall come up out of the land" of their captivity. This phrase is used repeatedly in the Pentateuch when the deliverance from

Egypt is spoken of, and therefore had great significance to the Jews. In chapter ii. 8, the prophet says, "She," Israel, "did not know that I gave her corn and wine and oil," a quotation from Deuteronomy vii., 13, where God says, "I will bless the fruit of thy land, thy corn and thy wine and thine oil." And, in the tenth verse, God says, "None shall deliver her out of my hand," a phrase taken from Deuteronomy xxxii., 39, "Neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand." In verse 11, we have mention of "her feast days," which are the Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles; her "new moons," Numbers xxviii., 11, 12; and "her Sabbaths," Leviticus xxiii., 3; "and all her solemn feasts." A very clear reference is made in the twelfth verse, in the word "rewards," meaning wages of whoredom, to Deuteronomy xxiii, 18. It is said in verse 17 that the Lord would take the "names of Baalim out of her mouth," which phrase is used in Exodus xxiii., 13, "make no mention of the names of other gods, neither let it be heard out of thy mouth." In chapter iv., 4, we read that reproof and rebuke are useless, for the "people are as they that strive with the priest." And how were they that strove with the priest? In Deuteronomy xvii., 12, we read that the "man that will not hearken unto the priest . . . shall die." There was reason, then, why no reproof should be given to the people,— they were past help. How clear is the reference to the Pentateuch in this passage! A very striking instance of quotation is found in chapter iv., 10. The prophet is describing the suffering that shall come upon the people for their sins; and he tells them, "They shall eat and not be

satisfied" (c.v., "not have enough"). In Leviticus xxvi., 26, where the Lord threatens calamities if the people sin, he says, "When I have broken the staff of your bread, . . . ye shall eat and not be satisfied," — a verbal quotation. In the same verse is a distinct reference to Genesis xxviii., 14, and Leviticus xx., 20, 21: "They shall commit whoredom, and shall not increase." The original word for "increase," "to break forth," is used in the promise to Jacob, "And thou shalt spread abroad ["break forth"] to the west and to the east," etc. This use of the word is *peculiar* to the Pentateuch; and the threatening of not increasing is conformed to the passage referred to in Leviticus and many other places in the Law. In the thirteenth verse, the prophet accuses the people of sin, because they have done as wickedly as the nations which they were commanded to destroy: "They sacrifice upon the tops of the mountains, and burn incense upon the hills, under oaks and poplars and elms." In Deuteronomy xii., 2, where the practices of the nations are described, the same phrases are used, except that, in the last clause, the prophet has substituted specific names for "every green tree." In chapter v., 6, the prophet says it will not be with them now as it was of old, when they "go with their flocks and with their herds" to seek the Lord, for he will have withdrawn from them on account of their wickedness. In describing the sacrifices which the people offered to the Lord, in the Pentateuch the phrase "with your flocks and with your herds" is very common. Why were "the princes of Judah like them that remove the landmark" ("bound," c.v.), and upon whom the prophet declares

that the Lord will "pour out his wrath like water"? Because in Deuteronomy xxvii., 17, it is said, "*Cursed* be he that removeth his neighbor's landmark." This reference is too striking to admit of doubt. And the prophet continues, "Ephraim is oppressed and crushed [c.v., broken in judgment] because he forsook the Lord"; just as it is declared it shall happen unto the nation, if they forsake God, in Deuteronomy xxviii., 33: "Thou shalt be only oppressed and crushed alway." In chapter v., 15, and vi., 1, we read, "In their affliction they will seek me early," and say, "Come, let us return unto the Lord, for he hath torn and he will heal us; he hath smitten and he will bind us up." This is a fulfilment of the prophecy in Deuteronomy iv., 30, "When thou art in affliction [c.v., tribulation], . . . in the latter days, and thou turn to the Lord thy God"; and in Deuteronomy xxxii., 39, "I kill and I make alive; I wound and I heal; neither is there any one that can deliver out of my hand." Compare with this Hosea v., 4, "I will tear, . . . and none shall deliver" (c.v., rescue). In chapter vii., 10, the people are reproved because, after all their afflictions, "they do not return to the Lord their God, nor seek him," as required in Deuteronomy iv., 29, 30. The declaration, "I will chastise them, as hath been proclaimed in their congregation" (c.v., "as their congregation hath heard"), chapter vii., 12, is to the point, as the laws were usually said to be proclaimed "to the congregation" in the Pentateuch. And here seems to be an explicit reference to punishments which had been threatened to the people at that time. In chapter viii., 6, there is an apparent reference in the original to the calf which was burned at

Horeb. The prophet says, "The calf of Samaria shall be broken in pieces" (made "kindlings" literally). In the twelfth verse there is the explicit declaration, "I have written to him the great things of my law"; or, as it should be translated, "I have *written* for him many laws; but they were counted as a strange thing." Here we have proof that the laws quoted were written, and these laws are found word for word in the Pentateuch. In the next verse is quoted the remarkable prophecy in Deuteronomy xxviii., 68, "They shall return to Egypt." In chapter ix., 4, in speaking of the calamity of the impending captivity, he says, "They shall not offer wine-offerings to the Lord; . . . their sacrifices shall be unto them as the bread of mourners; all that eat thereof shall be polluted." In Leviticus xix. is a full statement of the defiled condition of all who are mourning. In the fifth verse, it is asked, "What will ye do in the solemn day [*i.e.*, feast days generally], and in the day of the feast of the Lord?" (*i.e.*, of the Passover, or some other of the three great feasts),— showing that feast days were observed at this time in Israel. The historical allusions in this chapter are too numerous for quotation. The feast of the tabernacles was celebrated in Israel; for in chapter xii., 9, we read, "I will yet make thee to dwell in tabernacles, as in the days of the solemn feasts" (feast). In verse 14, it is said of Ephraim, "He shall leave his blood upon him," which is a phrase used in the Law to show the penalty which hangs over the evil-doer, Leviticus xx., 9: "He that curseth his father or his mother, his blood shall be upon him," *i.e.*, he shall be put to death.

But I must not dwell upon the writings of this

prophet any longer. We find that he speaks of the Law, sometimes almost makes a formal quotation from it, and in almost innumerable instances makes use of its language. I have marked more than twice as many clear references to the Law as I have quoted. But, if these are not sufficient to convince the reader, no number would be. They most clearly identify the Law which was "written," and with which Hosea was familiar, with the Pentateuch of Ezra, of the son of Sirach, of Josephus, and of Martin Luther. His prophecy is as full of allusions to the Pentateuch, and his style partakes as much of its flavor, as the sermons of the Puritans do of the Bible; and one would as soon think of denying that John Robinson or John Cotton had our New Testament as that Hosea had our Pentateuch. It is admitted that the ritual and priesthood were existing in perfection, and that the Pentateuch was in the hands of Malachi substantially as we have it to-day, yet he does not refer to its contents or to the ceremonies of the ritual any more frequently than Hosea, who lived three hundred years before him. If Hosea makes as free use of it as Malachi, why is it not conclusive evidence that he had it? This inference can be overcome only by very weighty objections.

(9) I must make some examination of the writings of Amos, who was a little earlier than Hosea. In chapter ii., 7, our translation reads, "and turn aside the way of the meek": it should be rendered, "wrest the judgment of the weak," which agrees with Exodus xxiii., 6, "Thou shalt not wrest the judgment of thy poor." An abominable sin is spoken of in the same verse, which the Lord says "profanes his holy name,"

—a verbal reference to Leviticus xx., 3: I will set my face against that man who "profanes my holy name." The wicked people are said (verse 8) "to lay themselves down upon clothes laid to pledge." Exodus xxii., 26, forbids this, and requires that "raiment taken to pledge" shall be delivered to the owner when "the sun goeth down." The phrase, verse 10, "and led you forty years in the wilderness," is a verbal quotation from Deuteronomy xxix., 5. The people are rebuked, verse 12, for giving "the Nazarites wine to drink." Why not? In Numbers vi., 3, the Nazarites' vow to abstain from wine is given.

The fourth chapter of Amos is so filled with references to the Pentateuch that a specific enumeration of them would be impossible in this study. Not less than a dozen instances of the use of language to be found in the different books of the Pentateuch could be quoted. I must content myself with a condensed summary, leaving the reader who is interested in this examination to pursue it into its details at his leisure. "Bring your sacrifices every morning," Numbers xxviii., 3, 4, "and your tithes after three years," Deuteronomy xiv., 28, which reads, "At the end of three years, thou shalt bring forth all the tithe of thine increase"; a very clear reference. "Offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving with leaven," Leviticus ii., 11, "and publish the free offerings," Leviticus xxii., 18. "I have given you want of bread," Leviticus xxvi., 26, "yet have ye not returned to me, saith the Lord." This last phrase is used several times in this chapter, and has evident reference to Deuteronomy iv., 30, where the people are exhorted, in their troubles, "to turn to the Lord their God." "I

have smitten you with blasting and mildew," Deuteronomy xxviii., 22. "I have sent among you the pestilence, after the manner of Egypt," as predicted in Leviticus xxvi., 25; Deuteronomy vii., 15; xxviii, 27. In chapter v., 11, the prophet says, "Ye have built houses of hewn stone, but ye shall not dwell in them"; Deuteronomy xxviii., 30, where it is said, "Thou shalt build an house, and thou shalt not dwell therein." Further, the prophet says, "Ye have planted pleasant vineyards, but ye shall not drink wine of them"; predicted in Deuteronomy xxviii., 39, "Thou shalt plant vineyards, . . . but shalt not drink of the wine." The prophet denounces them, because "they afflict the just, they take a bribe." Exodus xxiii., 8, Deuteronomy xvi., 19, declare "Thou shalt not wrest judgment, thou shalt not respect persons, neither take a gift" (bribe). In verse 17, he says, "I will pass through thee" as I passed through the land of Egypt on the dreadful night when the first-born were slain and you were preserved. Now you will be punished, and a great "wailing" will be heard among you, as a "great cry" was raised by Pharaoh and his servants. (Exodus xii., 30.) The Lord expresses his dislike (verses 21, 22) of their "feasts," their "solemn assemblies," their "burnt-offerings and meat-offerings," and of their "peace-offerings." (Numbers xxix., 25; Leviticus xxiii., 36; Deuteronomy xvi.) The prophet accuses the oppressors of the people of being so greedy of gain as to say, chap. viii., 5, "When will the *new moon* be gone that we may *sell corn*, and the Sabbath that we may *set forth* [open] wheat?" A remarkable resemblance exists in the original between the words marked in italics and those in Genesis xli.,

56, "And Joseph *opened* all the storehouses and *sold* unto the Egyptians." No "servile work" could be done on the new moon of the seventh month, or the beginning of the civil year. Leviticus xxiii., 24, 25. He further charges these greedy traffickers with "making the ephah small," Deuteronomy xxv., 14, "and the shekel great," Deuteronomy xxv., 13, "and falsifying the balances by deceit." Leviticus xix., 36, requires "just balances." When carried captive, the wicked people would not escape suffering, for the Lord says to them by the mouth of the prophet, chapter ix., 4, "Thence will I command the sword, and it shall slay them" (those in captivity), which is a reiteration of the threatening in Deuteronomy xxviii., 65, and Leviticus xxvi., 33, "I will draw out a sword after you among the heathen." In the same chapter, eighth verse, the Lord says, "I will destroy it [Israel] from off the face of the earth," which is a verbal repetition of the punishment threatened in Deuteronomy vi., 15, "The Lord thy God . . . will destroy thee from off the face of the earth."

These quotations from Amos make it evident that he was familiar with the language of the Pentateuch. He rebukes Israel for violating the laws therein contained, and writes precisely as if the contents of that book were as familiar to him as the contents of the gospel were to John Bunyan. He calls the book by the name which it has had through all succeeding years up to his time. In giving a general reason for the punishment which would come upon the people, he says, in chapter ii., 4, "They have despised the Law of the Lord, and have not kept his commandments," a direct reference to the threat in Leviticus xxvi., 15, where it is said, "If ye

shall despise my statutes," the most terrible calamities shall fall upon you. The customs, rites, worship which the prophet describes are all identical with those spoken of in "The Law."

It is important to remember that both Hosea and Amos prophesied in the kingdom of Israel. They addressed the rulers, princes, priests, and people of that nation as if *they* were familiar with the Law. They speak of them as keeping the feast days, the new moons, and the Sabbaths. Is it improbable that the people of Israel had a copy of the Law, whose contents are so fully stated in these prophecies? It is further to be remembered that Amos was "no prophet," that is, by education, "nor the son of a prophet"; he was a "shepherd and a gatherer of sycamore fruit." If, then, he was so familiar with "The Law," never having been educated in it, how much of its language must have been on the lips of those who had attended the schools of the prophets? There is more reason than some scholars are willing to allow for referring the Samaritan Pentateuch to a much earlier age than is commonly assigned to it. It is by no means improbable that copies of "The Law" existed in the northern kingdom before the captivity, and that the people who were left in the land had copies with them, and that it has been handed down among that people from age to age, to the present day. If such a supposition is reasonable, the existence of the Samaritan Pentateuch is evidence of the high antiquity of the Hebrew Pentateuch.

But I do not rest this argument on any such basis. I am tracing references to "The Law," the Pentateuch,

back through the Hebrew writings that have come down to us; and we find abundant evidence of its existence in the writings of the two prophets who were sent to prophesy to the kingdom of Israel. But this aside. We must pursue our inquiry still further.

10. Next in order comes the prophecy of Joel, who was a little the predecessor of Amos, at least in the opinion of some scholars; but he prophesied to the kingdom of Judah.

The prophecy of Joel is very brief, covering but a few pages. The whole spirit of his prophecy is derived from "The Law." His promises and threatenings are all derived from those contained in "The Law." He says, "The meat-offering and the drink-offering is cut off from the house of the Lord; the priests mourn." "The harvest of the field is perished, the river is dried up, the fig-tree languisheth; . . . call a solemn assembly," for the "locust hath eaten" up the harvest. Compare with these expressions Deuteronomy xxviii., 38–42. In the second chapter, the prophet directs them to call an assembly. "Blow ye the trumpet," says he. In Numbers x., 3, we find that this was the appointed method of calling an assembly. He says, describing the locusts, "There hath not been ever the like, neither shall there be any more after it, even to the years of many generations." This is a clear reference to Exodus x., 14, where, describing the locusts of the plague in Egypt, the writer says, "Before them there were no such locusts as they, neither after them shall there be such." In chapter ii., 13, the prophet exhorts the people to repent, assuring them that the Lord God "is gracious and merciful, slow to anger.

and of great kindness"; an assurance which he could well give, for, Exodus xxxiv., 6, the Lord himself descended in a cloud, and proclaimed, "The Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth." The prophet further says that the Lord will leave a blessing behind him, "a meat-offering and a drink-offering." Most earnestly he implores the people "to blow the trumpet, to proclaim a solemn assembly, to appoint a congregation, . . . to let the priests weep between the porch and the altar, and say, Spare thy people, O Lord, and give not their heritage to reproach, that the heathen should use a by-word against them" (marginal reading). In Deuteronomy xxviii., 37, the people are threatened, if they sin, with the punishment of becoming "a proverb and a by-word among all nations." The reference is clear. Joel's prophecy is filled with Mosaic terms, and with the spirit and letter of the Law. Let it be remembered that Hosea, Amos, and Joel, whose references to Deuteronomy are so numerous, wrote a century and more before Hilkiah forged it, according to Kuenen.*

11. The testimony of two more books yet remains to be examined, the Proverbs and Psalms. In Ecclesiastes and Solomon's Song, we find nothing to our purpose, nor should we expect to. Nor should we expect to find much light on our theme in the Book of Proverbs. The subject of the book forbids it. Yet even here are there some hints of the existence of the Pentateuch.

*Yet, notwithstanding this evidence that the prophetic writings are saturated with the spirit and sprinkled all over with the phrases and ceremonies of the Pentateuch, a writer in the *Unitarian Review* for November, 1880, p. 427, asks in a tone of haughty challenge, "What reference to Mosaic law or Mosaic rites can you find in any of the earlier prophets?" "What appeal to their authority?"

King Lemuel's mother taught him, chapter xxxi., 5, that princes should not drink wine lest they "forget the Law, and pervert the judgment of any that are afflicted." Deuteronomy xxiv., 17, Exodus xxiii., 6, "Thou shalt not pervert judgment." In chapter xxviii., 4, 7, 9, "The Law" is spoken of. So also in chapter xxix., 18, we read, "He that keepeth the Law, happy is he," "but where there is no vision the people perish." Other passages of like character are found in the book which it is unnecessary to quote, as they add nothing to our argument. Davidson says, Vol. II., p. 342, "The Proverbs are ethical maxims *deduced from the Mosaic Law* and Divine Providence." The Book of Psalms contains lyric poems, for the most part, which were composed during a long period of the nation's existence. Some were probably composed before the time of David, many by him, and by his contemporaries and immediate successors, and some as late as after the return from captivity. If we could certainly select those of the earliest date, they would be much more to our purpose than those composed at a later period. As in many cases such a distinction cannot accurately be made, I shall quote from those which are more generally conceded to be of the earlier class, after I have drawn a few illustrations from those of a confessedly later period. The seventy-eighth psalm is supposed to have been written much later than the time of David. It is an historical poem, and repeats the most prominent incidents recorded in the Pentateuch. It speaks distinctly of the "covenant of God," and declares that the people refused in early times "to walk in his Law"; that "he established a testimony in Jacob, and ap

pointed a Law in Israel," which he commanded the fathers to "make known to their children." Deuteronomy iv., 9, vi., 7, xi., 19, require that the Law should be taught to the children. The use of the language of the Pentateuch in this psalm is so pervading that I must ask readers to examine it for themselves in connection with this argument. To make quotations is impossible. Psalm cxix. is a very artistic poem, constructed with express reference to the Law, the statutes, the commandments, and the judgments of the Lord. Through one hundred and seventy-six verses, it labors, with all variety of phrase, to extol "The Law" of the Lord, and inculcate obedience to all its "statutes." In Psalm xcvii., the writer says that the Lord spake to his people "in the cloudy pillar; they kept his testimonies and the ordinance that he gave them." In Psalm lxxxix., 30–32, the writer, enumerating the calamities which shall rest upon the house of David, says, in the name of the Lord, "If his children forsake my Law, and walk not in my judgments; if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments; then will I visit their transgression with the rod." Moses is spoken of as one to whom God had made himself known, ciii., 7; cv., 26; cvi., 16, 23, 32. These psalms are also filled with the incidents and language of the Pentateuch. In Psalm xix. there is a comparison made between the instruction given in the works of Nature and that which is given in "The Law of the Lord." "The Law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. The

fear [by metonymy, that which teaches us the fear] of the Lord is clean, enduring forever; the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether." In Psalm xl., 8, we have a very clear statement of the existence of books in the time of David. "In the volume of the book it is written of me, . . . Thy law is within my heart." As it has been suggested that this may be a figurative reference to God's purposes, not to any literal volume, I do not press the inference that it refers to the *Book of the Law*, but simply say that it proves the existence of *written books* in the time of David; and we have seen already that, I. Kings ii., 3, David charges Solomon to keep the "statutes and commandments and judgments and testimonies" of the Lord, "as it is written in the Law of Moses." The poem and the history agree. In Psalm i., 2, it is said that the delight of the good man "is in the Law of the Lord, and in his Law doth he meditate day and night."

These references to the Pentateuch, under the same names which we have found in use from the time of Paul and the Son of Sirach, are proof of the existence of the same work which Paul and the Son of Sirach used, unless some proof can be brought that it was remodelled between these periods. Of such a transformation, history does not record a syllable: therefore the work is the same as that to which David and the Psalmists alluded, as that which Paul and the Son of Sirach used, unless internal evidence, derived from the book itself, can be brought to show the contrary. To that internal evidence, I shall attend in due time. I now confine myself to the historical evidence.

But we find not only the old names, but also the

style of the Pentateuch introduced into the Psalms, its facts alluded to, its rites mentioned. I will notice a few of the latter. In Psalm xix., 1, there is the same distinction between the heavens and the firmament as in Genesis i. The word "firmament" is a peculiar one, and is doubtless used by the Psalmist on that account. Psalm xxxiii., 6, 7, teaches us that "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made" (Genesis i., 14, "And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament"), "and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth" (Genesis ii., 1, "Thus the heavens and earth were finished, and all the host of them"). "He gathereth the waters of the sea together as a heap" (Genesis i., 9, "And God said, Let the waters . . . be gathered together into one place"). In Psalm lxxxi., 3–5, there is a direct reference to the time when a statute there named was enacted: "Blow the trumpet in the new moon" (Numbers x., 10, "In the beginnings of your month [*i.e.*, new moons], ye shall blow with the trumpets"), "in the time appointed, on our solemn feast day; for this is a statute for Israel and a law of the God of Jacob. This he ordained . . . when he went out through [of] the land of Egypt." Verse 6, "I removed from his shoulder the burden" (Exodus i., 11). In Psalm xv., 3–5, we read that a good man "backbiteth not with his tongue" (Leviticus xix., 16), "nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbor" (Exodus xxiii., 1). "He putteth not out his money to usury" (Exodus xxii., 25), "nor taketh a reward against the innocent" (Exodus xxiii., 8). "He sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not" (Numbers xxx., 2). These references are all too distinct to be mistaken.

"Burnt-offerings and sin-offerings" are spoken of in xl., 6; li., 19; lxvi., 13, 15: "I will go into thy house with burnt-offerings; . . . I will offer unto thee burnt sacrifices of fatlings, with the incense of rams." Psalm cxxxiii., the "precious ointment that ran down on Aaron's beard" refers to his anointing (Leviticus viii., 12), where Moses is said to pour the "anointing oil" on Aaron's head.

It is not necessary to accumulate these quotations any further. It is evident that, upon the supposition of the existence and familiar use of the Pentateuch by the writers of the Psalms, we could not expect to find more frequent allusions to the book, nor more evident use of its words and phrases, than we do find. Hence, the argument is as full and cogent from this quarter as is required for my purpose.

I have now closed my examination of the historical and poetical writings of the Jewish nation back to the time of David. And, all through both classes of writings, we find not only the *title* of the Pentateuch named in references to it, but we also find constant use of its *style*, and allusion to its rites, ceremonies, and laws. I hesitate not to say that no writing which has come down to our day from a remote antiquity can show such an array of historical evidence attesting its age as the writings of the Jews furnish to the existence of the Pentateuch in the time of David. The book which David referred Solomon to as the "Law of Moses," in which were "written the statutes, commandments, judgments, and testimonies of the Lord," is the book which now lies open before me, or else I

have no reason or right to speak of the history of Thucydides as being in our hands. Those who are not accustomed to inquiries of this kind may not be aware of the superior amount and quality of the evidence which can be adduced in favor of the existence of the Pentateuch in the time of David, over that which can be produced in favor of the early origin of any other work of remote antiquity which has come into our hands, and which, nevertheless, we accept as being sustained by all the evidence which, under the circumstances, could be expected.

Let us remember, too, the period at which we have arrived. We are within four hundred years or less of the time in which Moses lived, who is supposed by David to have written these laws. The golden age of Hebrew literature is fixed at this period. A glorious temple was to be erected in which the worship of Jehovah, as prescribed in "The Law," could be offered. The schools of the prophets had been sending out scholars into all parts of the land for a hundred years. It is incredible that a book containing the fundamental laws of such a nation, on an obedience to which rested their national destiny, could have been so universally referred to their great law-giver, if indeed he had no hand in its composition. Had we no fragments of history relating to the period between David and Moses, we could not hesitate to refer the book to him to whom it was referred at this period. The men of that age were abundantly capable of determining such a question. They were under the most imperative obligation to determine it correctly, and there is no more reason, historically, to suppose them to be

mistaken than we have to suppose that the English monarchs and scholars are mistaken in referring the Doomsday Book to the time of William the Conqueror.

SECTION IV. FROM DAVID TO MOSES.

As far as external historical evidence is concerned, I might pause here. But there are some earlier writings, some portions of which were composed probably before the time of David, or during his reign,—namely, the book of Judges; and some which, though relating to the times previous to him, were not composed till a later period,—namely, the Books of Samuel.

To understand the value of the evidence rendered by these books to the antiquity of the Pentateuch, a word is necessary respecting their age and contents. The Book of Joshua was written before the close of the reign of Solomon, if we can rely upon the statement made in chapter xvi., 10, where it is said, "The Canaanites dwell among the Ephraimites [in Gezer] unto this day." But, in I. Kings ix., 16, we read that Pharaoh "took Gezer, burned it with fire, slew the Canaanites, and gave it as a present to his daughter, Solomon's wife." The book may have been composed earlier, even in the reign of Saul, or during the life of Samuel. There is nothing in the style or contents of the book which requires a later author. The contents of the book are such as rather to forbid than admit any specific quotations from the Pentateuch, consisting, as they do in the first half, of a description of passing over Jordan, and of the battles of the

conquest, and, in the last half, of a condensed statement of the boundaries of the tribes and their cities.*

The Book of Judges tells us, in chapter i., 21, that "the Jebusites dwell with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem unto this day," which shows, if the passage can be relied upon, that the book, or the main part of it, must have been written before the end of David's reign, since in II. Samuel, chapter v., 6–8, we learn that David drove the Jebusites out of Jerusalem, and took the stronghold of Zion and dwelt in it. A passage in the appendix of the book, which was added at a later date, chapter xviii., 30, would probably place this addition as late as 721 B.C. "The day of the captivity of the land" is spoken of. There is nothing in the language or contents of the body of the book to forbid its composition in the early years of the monarchy, since its descriptions of the anarchical condition of the people have very much the appearance of an apology or good reason for a stronger and consolidated government, as well as of an illustration of the peril of "doing evil in the sight of the Lord." The subject of both the book and its appendix is such as not to require or even permit many references to the Pentateuch, made up as it is of battles and exploits of heroes and heroines, and devoting four chapters to the freaks and

* Davidson says (*Intro. O. T.*, Vol. I., p. 415): "The ecclesiastical state of the people under Joshua appears to have been in accordance with the divine law. There was the ark of the covenant, priests, a high priest Eleazer, Levitical cities. Circumcision and the passover were observed. The tabernacle was set up, and the congregation assembled beside it. [Dr. Oort, *Bible for Learners*, says, "The tabernacle never really existed except in the imagination of the writer" (of Exodus), who lived after the captivity.] The Reubenites, Gadites, and half-tribe of Manasseh 'kept all that Moses, the servant of God, commanded them.'"

follies and feats and gallantries of the renowned athlete, Samson.

The Books of Samuel, down to the reign of David, appear to be closely connected with the succeeding history, and very probably were the production of the author of the history of that reign, whose writings were used by the author of the Book of Kings, who wrote at the commencement of the captivity, 586 B.C. During this tumultuous period of establishing the monarchy, but little reference would be made, in brief annals, to rituals and customs. Weightier and novel matters would press upon the writer's attention. And in all these writings we cannot rely upon any stronger evidence of the age of the Pentateuch than is furnished by the opinion of the age in which they were written, as expressed by their authors. It is true that they did not rely wholly upon tradition. They had, apparently, in their hands scraps of records and songs which furnished some written testimony to the customs and laws of this period, and to the existence of the Mosaic ritual. These obscure references and passing hints we shall do well to notice and weigh.

In I. Samuel i., 3, we read that Hannah and her husband, a hundred years before the time of David, "went up yearly to worship and to sacrifice unto the Lord of hosts, in Shiloh," where the tabernacle was. In chapter i., 21, 22, the writer tells us that the journey was repeated the next year by the father alone, and that the second year the child Samuel was with them. This "yearly" journey was required by "The Law" at the feast of the passover, but we do not read of it again in the book, showing how many things customary are not

named. We read of the offering of "burnt-offerings" and "peace-offerings" at different times and at different places, since no spot had been selected as the permanent resting-place of the ark. There are, also, found some phrases in the Books of Samuel which the historian evidently took from the Books of Moses; but as he wrote at as late a period as is covered by some of the books already examined, and as his style would only prove the existence of the Pentateuch when he wrote, I will not occupy much space by making quotations. In I. Samuel, chapter xii., 14, Samuel says to the people, "If ye will not rebel against the commandment of the Lord," it will be well with you; "but if ye rebel against the commandment of the Lord, then shall the hand of the Lord be against you, as it was against your fathers." This is obviously said in reference to the Law, for "the commandment," "the testimony," are often used for the Pentateuch. The writer of the Book of Judges, chapter iii., 4, says, "They [the nations not conquered] were to prove Israel, . . . to know whether they would hearken unto the commandments of the Lord, which he had *commanded their fathers* by the *hand of Moses*." In Joshua i., 7, 8, the Lord is represented as thus addressing Joshua: "Be thou strong and very courageous, that thou mayest observe to do according to all the *Law which Moses*, my servant, commanded thee. . . . This *Book of the Law* shall not depart out of thy mouth, . . . that thou mayest do all that is written therein." In chapter viii., 30, 31, we read that "Joshua built an altar, . . . as Moses the servant of the Lord commanded the children of Israel, as it *is written in the Book of the Law of Moses*." In chapter xxiii., 6,

we read of what "is written in the Book of the Law of Moses"; and in chapter xxiv., 26, we read that "Joshua wrote these words in the Book of the Law of God."

Such are the names given in these early annals to the book or code by which the people were governed. Let us now see if the references to it or the customs of the period render it certain that our Pentateuch is intended by these names. The priests are represented in Joshua as "bearing the ark," and the "ark of the covenant," and the "ark of the Lord," and "the ark of the testimony"; and "Phinehas, the son of Aaron," is said to have "stood before the ark of the covenant of God in those days," in the Book of Judges; and in I. Samuel it is spoken of ten times, and in II. Samuel five times. In Joshua xviii., 1, "the tabernacle of the congregation" is said to "be set up at Shiloh," and it is mentioned again xxii., 19; and three times it is spoken of in Samuel. The "curtains" of the dwelling-place of the ark are mentioned in II. Samuel vii., 2, and in the sixth verse the "tent and tabernacle" are spoken of, describing the original tabernacle accurately, the "tent" signifying the outward covering of skins and cloth of goat's hair, and "the tabernacle" signifying the "curtains of fine twined linen and blue and purple and scarlet," Exodus xxvi., 1, 14. This passage shows how carefully the material and form of the ancient tabernacle had been preserved through all ages and vicissitudes, amid repairs and renewals down to the time of David, a period of about four hundred years, when we find him ambitious to erect a more imposing structure for the administration of the ritual. We read, in

I. Samuel xxi., 6, of the "shew bread" which was in the tabernacle at Nob, chapter xxii., 11, and which was "hallowed bread," of which David and his men were permitted to eat after much deliberation, as it was sacredly set apart for the priests, Leviticus xxiv., 9. In I. Samuel, during times bordering upon those of the Judges, we read frequently of "offerings" and "sacrifices," offered apparently at places where the "tabernacle" was from time to time located, and sometimes on altars built for the occasion.

These records of religious observances are quite frequent, though brief; but they are hints of what existed and was common, as the "yearly sacrifice" to which the people are said to go up is mentioned specially but three times. And it is to be remembered that these were turbulent times, and the writer of Judges does not dwell upon the years of peace, but describes almost exclusively the insurrections and forays and personal exploits of the time. We read of "priests" in Joshua and Judges and Samuel, and of their presence at the place of the tabernacle. There is no evidence which is decisive that any service which was allotted by the Law to a priest was performed by any other person. In the case of Samuel, there are two or three instances in which he may have offered sacrifice; but it is by no means clear that even in those a priest was not in attendance, though not spoken of. But, granting that Samuel did offer sacrifices two or three times, it does not follow that it was lawful, but rather that he violated the Law. And, further, if we can rely upon the record, the relation of Samuel to the priesthood was unique; and he may have felt authorized to act as a priest in

certain contingencies, if he did so. In either view of his action, it does not furnish even a presumption against the existence of the ritual; much less does it furnish an argument against its existence.

Did I not fear that I should utterly exhaust the patience of my readers, I should like to refer to some yet more obscure indications of the existence of the Pentateuch contained in these fragmentary sketches of the earliest anarchical times, and yet so exact as to command attention. I must satisfy my desire to give a specimen of them: I. Samuel i., 11, "And there shall no razor come upon his head"; a literal statement of the Law of the Nazarite, Numbers vi., 5. Chapter i., 24, she "took three bullocks and an ephah of flour" for her offering; just the right proportion of flour prescribed to a bullock, Numbers xxviii., 12. Chapter ii., 2, "Neither is there any rock like our God," is literally taken from Deuteronomy xxxii., 30. The departure from the ritual by the wicked sons of Eli is described in chapter ii., 13–15, in not "burning the fat" and the "sodden meat" which were prescribed in Leviticus vi., 28, and vii., 31–35. In verses 18, 19, the child Samuel's "linen ephod" is mentioned, and his "little coat" (robe), which was the priest's garment worn under the "ephod," both described in Exodus xxviii., 6, 31. In chapter iii., 3, we read of the "lamp which burnt" in the place "where the ark of God was," Exodus xxvii., 21. In chapter iii., 14, we read of the "sacrifice" (*zabach*) and "offering" (*mincah*) required by the Law in many places. I have already alluded to the frequency with which the "ark of the covenant" is mentioned. Chapter vi., 6, speaks of the "harden-

ing" of the people's hearts as the heart of "Pharaoh was hardened," Exodus xii., 31. In chapter vii., 9, we read that "Samuel took a sucking lamb, and offered it for a burnt-offering wholly to the Lord," Leviticus xxii., 7. Chapter viii., 3, Samuel's "sons took bribes and perverted judgment," Exodus xxiii., 8. Chapter ix., 24, "And the cook took up [heaved up] the shoulder, and set it before Saul," Exodus xxix., 27. Chapter x., 25, "Samuel wrote in a book the manner of the kingdom," Deuteronomy xvii., 18, 19. Chapter xx., 5, 6, "To-morrow is the new moon," said David, "let me go . . . to Bethlehem, for there is a yearly sacrifice there for all the family," Numbers x., 10; xxviii., 11. Verse 26, "Saul . . . thought something had befallen him [David], he is not clean; surely he is not clean," Leviticus vii., 20, 21. Chapter xxviii., 3, "And Saul put away those that had familiar spirits and wizards out of the land," Deuteronomy xviii., 11, 12. Chapter xxx., 7, 8, "And David said to Abiathar, the priest, bring me hither the ephod [in which were the Urim and Thummim]. . . . And David inquired of the Lord," Numbers xxvii., 21. Frequently the "Lord" is said to be "inquired of" in the life of David. In II. Samuel vi., 2–17, we read of the "ark of the Lord and the cherubim," and of the death of Uzzah for touching it, Numbers iv., 15.

In Judges i., 20, we read that "they gave Hebron unto Caleb, as Moses said," Numbers xiv., 24; Joshua xiv., 9, 13. In chapter ii., 17, 20, 22, the people are charged with going "a whoring after other gods, and turning quickly out of the way which their fathers walked in, . . . transgressing my covenant, which their fathers did keep" (chap. iii., 6); and the children of

Israel "took their [Canaanites'] daughters to be their wives, and gave their daughters to their sons, and served their gods," and, verse 4, did not "hearken unto the commandments of the Lord, which he commanded the fathers by the hand of Moses." Read the Law, Exodus xxxiv., 15, 16. The "ephod," in which were the Urim and Thummim, is spoken of as if essential even in forbidden forms of consultation, viii., 27; xvii., 5; xviii., 14, 17, 18. In xiii., 19, we read that "Manoah took a kid with a meat [meal] offering, and offered it upon a rock to the Lord." This kind of offering is required, Numbers xv., 24. "Burnt-offerings" and "peace-offerings" are mentioned in xiii., 16; xx., 26; xxi., 4. "The ark of the covenant" is spoken of, xx., 27. "The house of God in Shiloh," that is the "tabernacle," is spoken of in xviii., 31, and very probably also in xix., 18; xx., 18, 26, 31; and xxi., 2. Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron, "stands before the ark," xx., 28. "A man plucked off his shoe, and gave it to his neighbor to confirm" a bargain respecting marriage under peculiar circumstance, as reported in Ruth iv., 8. The Law is found in Deuteronomy xxv., 9. A reference is also made in iv., 12, to Genesis xxxviii., 29.

But I must refrain, or patience will be utterly exhausted. I wished to quote some of my notes on Joshua, especially those including passages where it is said that something was done "as Moses the servant of the Lord commanded," as, in chapter xi., 12, "Joshua smote all the cities of those kings and all the kings of them with the edge of the sword, and he utterly destroyed them, as Moses the servant of the Lord commanded." The command of Moses is in

Numbers xxxiii., 52, and Deuteronomy vii., 2, "Thou shalt smite them and utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor shew mercy unto them." I leave them all, and close here the direct historical or external evidence of the antiquity of the Pentateuch. Fragmentary and obscure as many of these notices and references are in these early books, I submit that they are as numerous and as explicit as any reasonable critic would expect to find. I confess to my own surprise at finding so many. Only Hebraists can estimate the loss I feel in not being able to make these quotations from the original language, that their force might be fully estimated.*

I cannot better meet the objection which is raised against the existence of the Mosaic ritual during the time of the Judges and Samuel, founded upon the infrequent mention of it and of its observance, than by refer-

* Much has been made by Kuenen, Graf, Prof. Smith, and others, of the use of the words, "the priests, the Levites," in Deuteronomy xvii., 9, 18, and elsewhere, without the copulative conjunction, "and," as if it proved that there was no distinct portion of the tribe of Levite priests before the captivity. But the same formula is used *after* the captivity (Nehemiah x, 28, 34; xi., 20; I. Chronicles ix., 2; II. Chronicles v., 5; xxiii., 18; xxx., 27; Isaiah lxvi., 21; Jeremiah xxxiii., 18), showing that, however it is to be explained, it certainly does not mean that all Levites were priests or could be; but undoubtedly it meant that all priests were Levites of the tribe of Levi, as the history testifies. There are only twenty-four places in the Old Testament where this phrase is used, and these may well be explained by the not unusual grammatical *asyndetic construction*, where "conjunctions which serve to connect words and phrases are omitted," as in Genesis xxxi., "yesterday [and] the day before"; Judges xix., 2, "a year [and] four months"; Habakkuk iii., 11, "sun [and] moon"; Nahum iii., 1, "it is full of lies [and] robbery"; Isaiah lxiii., 11, "Moses [and] his people"; Proverbs xxii., 21, "words [and] truth"; Zechariah i., 13, "words [and] consolations"; Exodus xxiv., 5, "offerings [and] peace-offerings." These examples must suffice. To build up a theory of the Jewish priesthood on this phrase used but twenty-four times in opposition to the clear and explicit declarations of both the law in the Pentateuch and the testimony of subsequent history is erecting a pyramid on its apex.

ring to the early history of the colony of Plymouth. That the Pilgrims had the Bible and ministers and churches and regular services on Sunday, everybody knows. William Bradford, for many years governor of the colony, wrote a history of it down to 1646, or for twenty-six years after the colony landed at Plymouth. It makes an octavo volume of four hundred and forty-four pages. I have looked through its pages to see how he treats the subject of religion,—its ministry, its church, its ordinances, its Bible. I may have overlooked some instances in which he speaks of them, but I am confident they can be but few. He mentions "the Lord's day" but twice; he speaks of "ministers" but fifteen times; of the "church" but twenty times; of "baptism" but once; and in every instance very briefly. Four times he speaks of the "Scriptures"; four times of "the word of God"; and once of "the infallible word of God,"—evidently meaning in all these cases the Bible. There are repeated quotations from the Bible, and its language is used frequently; and sometimes the book and the chapter and verse are mentioned from which the quotation is taken. And the "gospel" is spoken of ten times as if the New Testament was meant in distinction from the Old; and once "the pure Testament of Christ" is named, with evident reference to the New Testament. There is one reference to "neglecting hearing the word on the Lord's day." The choice of a "pastor" is spoken of three or four times. Two instances of setting apart a "day of humiliation" are recorded. "Taxing for preaching" is once spoken of. And yet this history is written in a religious spirit, and "God's providence" is mentioned

on almost every page. Now, the very brief Book of Judges covers a period ten times as long as Bradford's history does, and would give room for ten times less reference to the ritual than Bradford makes to the Pilgrims' ecclesiastical affairs, were the book as large as Bradford's; but, if its size is taken into the account also, there would be eighty times less chance in Judges to treat of religious rites and books than in Bradford; and if Bradford does not speak of the Bible in any phraseology, under any name, but about sixteen times, how many times could we expect Judges to speak of the "Law of Moses," on the supposition that it was used as freely and observed as scrupulously during that period as the Bible was by the Pilgrims? An answer to this question gives the weight of the objection named above, and it is found to be of no value. And, in farther confirmation of this estimate of the little weight to be attached to this objection, another cause of the infrequent reference to the Law and its ritual is found in Dr. Kuenen's *Religion of Israel.* He says (Vol. II., p. 293), "A temporary abeyance of the ritual legislation is not inconceivable" under "kings indisposed" to regard it. Much more, then, may we suppose that its observance was frequently held in "abeyance" during the stormy times of the Judges, and the convulsions which attended the establishment of the monarchy.

If "amidst arms laws are silent," we should not expect to hear anything of ritual observances during the tumults of the Judges.

This would be the place to examine the evidence which the Book of Deuteronomy furnishes of the existence of the Book of the Law, the ritual code, were

it not that the references to it are so intimately connected with the internal evidence, the second division of my Study, as to make its examination at that time most convenient and suitable. It must suffice, therefore, to say here and now that the existence of some such book or code is clearly implied, if not necessitated, by the laws quoted and amended, and the ceremonies modified and the demands withdrawn. These will be fully examined and illustrated in due time, and are of such a nature and so numerous as to bind all the previous historical evidence back to a date as early as the death of Moses.

We have now traced back through a period of over a thousand years notices of a work containing the laws which governed the Jews. We find that the various *names* by which it is called, beginning with the New Testament, in all the works which have come down to our time, are repeated in an unbroken series back to the time of Joshua. "The Law," "The Law of Moses," "The Law of the Lord," "The Book of the Law," "The Book of the Law by the hand of Moses," "The Book of the Law of the Lord," "The statutes and commandments of the Lord," are used as names to designate the Pentateuch from the days of Paul to the days of Joshua. And, further than this, we have found that the *passages which are quoted* by all this series of writers from the book referred to under those names are contained in the Pentateuch, and are often quoted with verbal exactness, even when the language of the Pentateuch is peculiar. And, still further, we have found that *peculiar words and phrases* are used

frequently in all these writings, which are most obviously taken from "The Law," showing that it was a book whose contents were as familiar to these writers as the language of the New Testament is to the preachers of our day. In a word, we have found all the evidence that could be expected, and vastly more than is found for the antiquity of any other writing of an age even much less remote.

The whole atmosphere of these books is fragrant with the incense which rose from the Law, and the whole elaborate, magnificent ritual of the nation is found imbedded in it. Our Pentateuch did exist in their day. It must have existed, or all historical evidence is false and worthless.

It is hardly necessary to allude to an objection to the early origin of the Pentateuch which was raised by a former class of critics, and pressed with great vehemence. It was maintained that the art of writing, even if known, was not sufficiently advanced to produce such works as the Pentateuch as early as the time of Moses. Modern discoveries, however, in Egypt and Chaldea and Babylonia have removed all doubt that writing was common in all these countries as early as the age of Moses. The walls of the tombs and temples of Egypt are adorned with representations of scribes engaged in writing; and a room has been opened in one of the great palaces which is called a "library," showing that works were collected for use. Cloth, papyrus, skins, and stones were used for engraving and writing. Rituals and financial documents of almost every kind are found among the relics in the tombs. In Chaldea and Babylonia, also, writings are

found on tablets of hardened clay, showing that poems were written in the Ur of Abraham before he was born. The Legends of Izdubar are about half as long as the Iliad, and they were written five centuries before the birth of Moses. And from that remote date, 2000 B.C., down, we have writings of every kind,— accounts, deeds, biographies, histories, legends, etc.,— demonstrating not only the possibility, but the probability that the great law-giver of Israel would commit his ritual and code to writing, as it is affirmed in the Pentateuch that he did. But I have lingered on this effete objection longer than its inherent weight justifies; yet as an illustration of the baselessness of many other objections, and of the confirmation of the antiquity of the Pentateuch found in the abundance of books and writings of various kinds of a far earlier date even, it seemed necessary to say as much as this respecting it.

It may be expected that something will be said at this point respecting the marvellous events which are recorded in the historical portions of the Pentateuch. As this Study is not exegetical, but historical, such an inquiry does not fall within my subject; at least, I have no occasion to treat of these marvellous events any further than their record affects the question of the age and origin of the Pentateuch. The historical book of Genesis closes at least two centuries before the time of the Hebrew law-giver, and is evidently composed of such traditions, recorded and oral, as had come down to his time. We have no conclusive proof that the wonderful things there recorded are true, or that they ever transpired; and the contents of the book do not in the slightest degree weigh against the opinion that

it was written or compiled in the Mosaic age, while the "Archaic Language" was in use. I enter into no speculation on this subject.* . . . Were these wonderful events accurately recorded, and were they stupendous miracles, the antiquity of the Pentateuch would not be in the least affected by it, for that is proved in an entirely independent manner. Almighty power is amply equal to doing what is here recorded; and, if any one chooses that interpretation of these remarkable events, the way is open without in the slightest degree shaking the conclusion, otherwise reached, of the age and origin of the Pentateuch. . . .

It is hardly necessary to remind the intelligent reader that passages have occasionally found their way into the text which were at first only marginal notes and explanations of names and places,—which has happened to all ancient writings, and by no means proves the composition of the work itself to have been at as late a period as that of the note. A few specimens of these later notes will be given. Genesis xii., 6, "And the Canaanite was then in the land." Genesis xiii., 7, "And the Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelt in the land." These sentences were added after the conquest. Genesis xxiii., 2, "In Kirjath-arba; the same is Hebron." The last words were written after the conquest, to define an ancient city. Another passage shows that the interpolated note was not written till after the monarchy was established: Genesis xxxvi., 31, "before there reigned any king over the

* In the present edition of this "*study*," one or two paragraphs, not essential to the main argument, and "not closely connected with the subject," are omitted, and two foot-notes are incorporated in the text. H.

land of Israel." The passage respecting the cessation of the manna (Exodus xvi., 35) belongs to the same class. Leviticus xviii., 28, "as it spued out the nations before you," is evidently a note. Deuteronomy ii., 12, contains another. So also Exodus vi., 20, and xi., 3, unless, as is more probable, the whole account, Exodus i.–xix., 25, was written later. "The meekness of the man Moses," Numbers xii., 3, is clearly a marginal note. These are specimens of the explanatory notes which have found their way into the text. Their parenthetical character most clearly shows that such was their origin, and they raise hardly the slightest antecedent presumption against the antiquity of the original work.

. . . But it is time to return to the direct discussion of my subject, which is not related except very remotely to any of these questions, any more than the age and authorship of *Gulliver's Travels* and *Robinson Crusoe* are related to, or depend upon, the authenticity, the truth of, the accounts recorded in them. The contents may be incredible, but their age and authorship may be indubitable. Things differing so widely must not be confounded with each other.

Great stress is laid upon the fact by many writers, and by Professor Smith in particular, that "anointed stones" (*Matstsebahs*) were erected, and "carved images" set up by kings and priests until the captivity, and thus proving that the law against idol-worship was not in existence. But it is evident that many of these "anointed stones" and "carved images" were not made for worship, and were forbidden by the law only when worshipped. Not only were the curtains of the

tabernacle "wrought with cherubim of cunning work" (Exodus xxxvi., 8), but two cherubim were made of pure gold to stand on either end of the mercy-seat in the Most Holy place, on the Most Holy ark (xxxvii., 10). The second commandment did not forbid making "carved images," but it forbid making carved work or any images *for worship* (Exodus xx., 4, 5). When Solomon erected his Temple, he not only covered the walls with "carvings of cherubim and palm-trees and open flowers," but he set up two pillars at the entrance of the Temple, covered all over with carvings of vines and pomegranates, and made a molten sea "which stood upon twelve oxen," and "between the ledges were lions, oxen, and cherubim," showing that Solomon did not interpret the law as forbidding making images for *ornament*, but for *gods* (I. Kings vi.). If any one should say that all this use of carved ornaments, and images of beasts and fruits and vines, shows either the absence of the law or its disregard, let him turn to Ezekiel, and he will find that his ideal temple is adorned in the same manner, as far as he gives a particular description of it. Not only were cherubim and palm-trees carved upon the walls of the temple, but each "cherub had two faces, the face of a man and the face of a young lion" (Ezekiel xli.). So the great reformer and composer of the law, as some maintain, did not hesitate to use "carved images" to ornament his ideal temple, while in his law — for it is maintained by some of these authors that Ezekiel wrote Leviticus xvii.–xxvi.— he had *absolutely forbidden* all images for any use. So evident is it that the

second commandment only forbade the use of images as representing Jehovah, and set up for worship.

I have carefully examined all the cases of disregard of the Levitical law referred to by Professor Smith, which are recorded as taking place down to the time of David and a little after, and find not one which is not impliedly in violation of the law or excused on the ground of the unsettled state of the nation, or growing out of a false interpretation of the law itself. The worship of strange gods in the time of Solomon, and under his patronage, was not more antagonistic to the Levitical law than was the worship of images under the patronage of the Pope in the tenth century. The universal prevalence of taking oaths all over Christendom, and the numerous grounds of divorce in all Christian lands, would be greater evidence of the non-existence of the gospel history than the offering of sacrifices by Samuel and Saul and Solomon is of the non-existence of the Levitical law which permitted the priests alone to offer them,— if indeed these men and others did offer them, for often what one does by another as his agent one is said to do himself, as Solomon is said to have built the Temple, though he hewed neither stone nor timber.

SECTION V. CONCLUSION OF THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE.

Here I rest the *historical evidence* for the antiquity of the Pentateuch. Were there no internal evidence in support of the external, we should be obliged, by the laws of historical criticism, to accept "The Book of the Law of Moses" as originating in his age. That

the last four books, or portions of them, indirectly profess to have been written in that age, is not disputed. The validity of this profession is sustained by the internal as well as by the external evidence, as I shall show. But, before examining it, I will quote some of the opinions of leading liberal, not to say radical, critics on the antiquity of portions, at least, and large ones, of the books contained in the Pentateuch, that the reader may see the extravagance of some recently broached hypotheses, and how very near these able scholars come to sustaining the result of my own historical inquiry.

De Wette says (§ 162, b.), "He [Amos] must have had the Book of Genesis, *in its present form*, about 790 B.C." "Hosea (785 B.C.) affords us a trace of its existence. He must have known *the Book of Numbers*, as well as the original documents and later fragments of Genesis." "Isaiah (759 B.C.) evidently refers to Genesis." And "Micah (725 B.C.) refers to Numbers and Genesis." "The discovery of the Book of the Law in the Temple, under Josiah's reign, about 624 B.C., related in II. Kings xxii., is the first certain trace of the existence of the Pentateuch *in its present form*" (§ 162, a.). And he says (§ 12, b.), "Our present four books of Moses originated in the time of Solomon," 1000 B.C. De Wette decides that "the Elohim document was written in the time of Samuel or Saul" (1100 B.C.) (§ 158), and the "Jehovistic document before the reformation under Hezekiah took place" (726 B.C.) (§ 159). But this whole hypothesis of the use of Elohistic and Jehovistic documents, especially after the Book of Genesis, is shown to be without sufficient reason, and all

conclusions drawn from it are therefore unreliable. The "archaic" words and phrases which Ewald and Gesenius and De Wette maintain are found in the Pentateuch are as numerous in what are called the "Jehovistic" documents as in the Elohistic; but the former, according to De Wette, was written about three hundred years after the latter. He says, "The Pentateuch was *completed* about the time of Josiah" (§ 12, b.).

Dr. Davidson (Vol. I., p. 133) says, "The present Pentateuch had been completed shortly before the reign of Josiah" (641 B.C.), "in the reign of Manasseh" (690 B.C.?) (p. 123). "The Book of the Law of Moses, spoken of II. Kings xiv., 6, may or may not have been the whole Pentateuch. The notice in question proceeds from the compiler of the Kings, who wrote after the present Pentateuch was completed. . . . In this passage, we understand *the Book of the Law to be coextensive with the Pentateuch*" (p. 119). "The same meaning may be assigned to the same phrase in II. Kings xxii., 8, 11, and II. Chronicles xxxiv., 14, 15," where Shaphan is said to have found "The Book of the Law in the house of the Lord." And Dr. Davidson goes so far as to say that it must have the same sense in II. Chronicles xvii., 9, where it is said Jehoshaphat (912 B.C.) sent out men to teach "the Book of the Law of the Lord through all the cities of Judah." This statement is made on the authority, as the writer of Chronicles says, of what he found "written in the Book of Jehu, the son of Hanani," whose works were a part of "the book of the kings of Israel." On this admission it is not easy to see why Dr. Davidson does not also admit that the Pentateuch, at least, may have been

in existence at this time "in its present form." He does say with emphasis that "it is impossible to assign it to so late a date" as the time of Ezra (p. 122). He also maintains that Moses wrote not only the commandments, Exodus xx., but also xxi.–xxiii., 19; xxv.–xxxi. He further claims that Moses was the writer of Leviticus i.–vii., xi.–xvii., "which have the genuine Mosaic stamp" very perceptibly. Numbers i. "exhibits a minuteness, circumstantiality, and historical verisimilitude which scarcely allow of a different writer. *All is natural on the supposition of their belonging to the time of Moses.* Chapter iv. belongs to the same times; x., 1–8, must be regarded as Mosaic; xix. is a wilderness enactment. These are not the only parts of the three middle books of the Pentateuch written by Moses. The tabernacle was made in the wilderness, and the Levitical legislation was *Mosaic* in its origin and essence" (Vol. I., pp. 109–113). Here are about *thirty chapters* attributed to the pen of Moses in Exodus —Numbers by as radical a critic as Dr. Davidson. Lengerke places the Elohistic document in the time of Solomon and the Jehovistic in the time of Hezekiah. Tuch places the Elohistic document in the time of Saul, and the Jehovistic in the time of Solomon. Stähelin places the Elohistic document in the time of the Judges and the Jehovistic in the time of Manasseh. Ewald, whose theory of documents was peculiar and accepted by few or none, believed they were all written before the end of the seventh century B.C., and assumed nearly their present form (*History of Israel*, Vol. I., p. 130). Some fragments, he thinks, were pre-Mosaic; one large one as old as the begin-

ning of Samuel's jurisdiction; another larger portion of the Pentateuch, which he calls by the name of the "Book of Origins," was composed in the reign of Solomon, but all were written three hundred years before the time of Ezra, to whose authorship the Dutch school refer a large portion of them.

It will be observed that all these scholars who had *no theories of the evolution of religious ideas* to support remit the origin of the largest portion of the Pentateuch to a very early period, and all of it to times before the reign of Josiah, 640 B.C., or two hundred years before the time of the return of Ezra. But the distinction which these scholars make between the Elohistic and Jehovistic portions of the last four books is chimerical, as will be made evident. The "archaic" style is as obvious in the Jehovistic as in the Elohistic portion; and to date the one in the time of the Judges, as Stähelin does, and the other in the time of Manasseh, five hundred years later, is a leap in literary criticism which cannot be imitated nor vindicated, and proves conclusively the falseness of these theories. Were there, therefore, no further or other evidence of the age and probable author of the Pentateuch, I should feel justified in claiming that its antiquity and authorship were as fully proved as could be reasonably expected when we consider the scant literature of these early ages and nations. But more and more conclusive proof, if possible, is waiting for admittance, derived from the writings themselves.

PART II.

INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

To appreciate fully the force of the *internal evidence* which I shall present respecting the age of the Pentateuch, it is necessary to consider the circumstances under which the external evidence raises the strongest probability, if it does not prove, that it was written, and the kind of composition, both in style and construction, which under those circumstances we should expect to find.

According to the presumption raised by the external evidence and their own profession, these writings, or a large part of them, were composed during a period of forty years in which the Jewish people were sojourning in the region lying between Egypt and Palestine or Canaan. They had just escaped — a portion at least of them — as slaves from long and bitter servitude in Egypt, and were on their way to take possession of the land which their fathers had inhabited, and from which they had emigrated some hundreds of years before into Egypt. During this sojourn in the wilderness, they received laws adapted to their condition, and directing their occupation and mode of life and worship in the country of which they were to take possession. Their situation was peculiar, and peculiar regulations would be needed for both their civil and religious, as well as social, welfare. Difficulties would arise in the interpretation and execution of a new code of laws under new circumstances. Rebellions would take place when any

special perils awaited the people or any disappointment overtook them. We should expect in a book composed under such circumstances that many minute incidents then occurring would be related, many laws passed, growing out of passing events, many difficulties recorded in the execution of the laws, and growing out of the contradictory character of some parts of their theoretical and experimental legislation. We should expect that the record of these years would be fragmentary, journal-like, often abrupt in its statements, disconnected, incoherent, omitting periods in which nothing specially worthy of record transpired, recording many things which have little interest to us, but which were of great importance to them. Such would be the character of the book if written under such circumstances as I have supposed, and which are affirmed in the book itself to be the circumstances in which it was composed.

Nor these marks only should we expect to find. The book would have passed through all manner of perils during the turbulent period of the judges and the establishment of the monarchy, when it had no secure place for preservation and would undoubtedly suffer in the disarrangement of its parts, the loss of some of them, the errors of any attempts at copying and correcting, the glosses of subsequent scribes to render old expressions intelligible, old names modern, old customs understood. We should expect to find, scattered all through it, the explanations, additions, queries, of more modern writers, such as the compliment to the "meekness" of Moses, the song at the old well, the modern names of old towns and old professions.

Let us now examine the books, and see whether the construction and contents of the Pentateuch do not indicate pretty clearly such an origin; whether it does not "breathe the desert air"; whether the camp and a nomadic state do not give form and coloring to the whole work; and whether the language does not contain archaic and obsolete words, and forms of words, and use words in a peculiar sense, all of which indicate a period much earlier than that in which the remaining books of the Old Testament were composed, and prove past successful refutation the Mosaic Age of the work.

SECTION I. EVIDENCE FROM STYLE AND LANGUAGE.

I will first examine the proof of its antiquity to be found in the Style and Language of the Pentateuch. Respecting "the archaisms and other peculiarities of the language" which are found in Pentateuch, De Wette says, "All that can be proved [by them] is that *some of the fragments of which it is composed are earlier than others.*" "And since the Book of Joshua, notwithstanding its affinity with Deuteronomy, does *not* possess in common with it certain archaisms, we must admit that a certain uniformity of language was observed and established by the author or compiler."* Let the reader mark two important affirmations: (1) There *are* "archaisms and other peculiarities of language" in the Pentateuch. (2) They are so marked as to distinguish even the Book of Deuteronomy from the Book of Joshua, in which they are not found. But, says De

*§ 157.

Wette, "all that can be proved by these archaisms and peculiarities of language is that some of the fragments of which it [the Pentateuch] is composed are earlier than others." Now, the fact respecting these "archaisms and peculiarities" is that they are found in both the so-called Elohistic and Jehovistic documents as selected by De Wette himself. They are not limited to any of these theoretical or real documents or fragments. *They pervade the whole work.* They make as clear a distinction between the Pentateuch and all the following books of the Bible as the contents of the rocks do between the Eocene and the Miocene periods; and it is lamentable that he should have allowed himself, when struggling with this objection to his theory of the late origin of the Pentateuch, derived from its "archaisms and peculiarities of language," to entirely misrepresent the method and result of Jahn's Study on this subject. He says,* "Jahn, without examining and sifting, has huddled all together, . . . especially [names of] things which do not occur elsewhere,—technical terms." This is just what Jahn did *not* do, what he especially avoided. He omitted all such words as De Wette accuses him, in this quotation, of introducing, as our subsequent notice of Jahn's method will show. In § 34, De Wette says, "The oldest writers, the authors of the Pentateuch, . . . write in the purest and most beautiful language. . . . During the exile and after it, the influence of the Aramæan language becomes visible, as well as other peculiarities in the usage of the language." Gesenius divides Hebrew literature into two periods, that before and during and that after

*§ 157, Note a.

the captivity. The "Aramæan tinges" all the second period. "The Pentateuch belongs to the first period, with Joshua and Judges and Samuel and Kings." And what is unaccountable is that, after saying that "the language and usage of the Pentateuch, in the historical passages, agree perfectly with those of the other historical books," he immediately continues: "However, the Pentateuch has some peculiarities," which he concedes may indicate "a high antiquity of these books."* Gesenius obviously means by this that they are the oldest in Hebrew literature, as the "archaisms" prove, and consequently were not written in whole or in part by Ezra. But Gesenius says more than this: "From the circumstance that these idioms appear also in the later Book of Deuteronomy, it is in the highest degree probable that a *conforming* hand has been busy with them." Mark the consequence of this "probability." Deuteronomy is supposed to be the book found or forged by Hilkiah. If so, as these critics maintain, then "the archaisms and peculiarities of language," which it is affirmed distinguish the four other books of the Pentateuch, Genesis — Numbers, had *already gone out of use*, and rendered it necessary for the writer of Deuteronomy to "*conform*" his style to those older books, in order that his forgery might escape detection. But if these books, Genesis — Numbers, were *not* written, as the Dutch school maintain, till during the captivity and after it, why was it necessary that the writer of Deuteronomy should feel compelled to "conform" his style to that of books not in existence? Indeed, to ordinary minds, it does not seem possible that he could

* De Wette, Vol. I., Appendix D, § 8.

do it without miraculous foresight. And, more wonderful still, why should these forgers of the laws during and after the captivity have taken so much pains to introduce these "archaisms and peculiarities" when there was no old literature to show that they ever existed, no older books considered sacred?

In order, however, to justify his placing Deuteronomy at a considerably later period than Genesis — Numbers, Gesenius says: "A remarkably different style prevails in Deuteronomy [from that in the earlier books]. Its most remarkable characteristic consists in a certain diffuse, rhetorical, and moralizing tone, and the constant return of favorite phrases." That is to say, "its most remarkable characteristic" is precisely that which distinguishes an oration from a statute, an address from an enactment. Deuteronomy is an oration, an address. Exodus — Numbers are made up of "orders" and "laws." They demand a different style from an address, and they have it. Yet the fragments of addresses which are scattered through these earlier books are as "diffuse, rhetorical, and moralizing in tone" as Deuteronomy. There is nothing in the *style* of Deuteronomy to separate it in age from the other books. The different styles demanded by moral precepts and statute laws and specifications for work and an address fully explain and justify the difference between the style of Exodus — Numbers and that of Deuteronomy.

Then, again, *the mood of mind* in which a person writes, and whether he dictates or holds the pen, has his extemporaneous address taken down by another or writes it out afterwards himself, make a difference in the same person's style which few critics appreciate. As I

write, a notable instance of it comes to mind. It is in Mr. Whipple's *Memoir of Thomas Starr King.** In an interview with Mr. King, Mr. Whipple says: "I maintained that he lost in compactness many of the advantages he gained in compass,— that his pen when placed in his own fingers not only hit on the best word or phrase to express his thought, but really deepened the thought by the pauses which composition exacts. The dispute culminated late one Sunday evening after he had delivered a carefully premeditated lecture on Hildebrand. I recklessly offered to distinguish among the promiscuous passages which were fresh in my memory those which he had himself written from those he had dictated to his amanuensis. Manuscript in hand, he laughingly defied me to undertake the task. By good luck, I happened to be *right in every guess*." Two thousand years hence or less, some critic of this disintegrating school will be proving to admiring students of "advanced thought" that this lecture on Hildebrand is a composite work patched up by a later hand from different authors!

As this matter of style has an important, not to say a decisive, bearing on the age of the Pentateuch, I make one more reference to the opinion of Gesenius. He says, in his *Hebrew Grammar*, Introduction, 3: "The Pentateuch undoubtedly has some peculiarities of language which may pass for *archaisms*," and then proceeds to name a few which distinguish it from all other literature before the captivity: "Jeremiah and Ezekiel are examples of a decided approach to the Aramæan hue of the silver age," or to the books written

*Page 58.

during the later period of the captivity and after the return, "in all of which a Chaldee [Aramæan] coloring, although in different degrees, is exhibited." He says further, as quoted in Parker's *De Wette*,* "As the language appears at present in the writings of the Old Testament, we can distinguish in them only two periods distinctly marked by their character,— those writings *before* the exile and those *during the exile and after it*." On page 443, he says: "With the exile begins a *new* epoch for language and literature, which is *particularly distinguished* by an approach to the cognate East-Aramæan dialect to which the Jews in the land of exile became accustomed." And he further says, page 450: "Ezekiel stands on the borders of the two periods. . . . He shares many peculiar terms and Chaldaic expressions with his contemporary, Jeremiah. But they are more numerous in Ezekiel; and, among all writers of the Old Testament, perhaps he has proportionably the greatest number of grammatical anomalies and inaccuracies." "Ecclesiastes is tinged most deeply with Aramæan dye." This would seem to be conclusive respecting the composition of any part of the Pentateuch in this period or near it, and yet we are gravely told by Dr. Kuenen that Leviticus xviii.–xxvi. was written by this eminently Chaldeeizing Ezekiel.

Dr. Davidson says: "There are some *peculiarities* in the Pentateuch . . . which were afterwards modified or dropped. There are *diversities* between the language as found in it, and the language some centuries after, which can be recognized." "The Aramæan [Chaldee] element is a characteristic feature which distinguishes

* Vol. I., Appendix D, p. 440.

the language of this [later] period." "This deterioration is observable even in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, who, in point of language, stand on the borders of the two ages," that before and that after the captivity. "It is still more noticeable in the post-exile prophets." * And yet a school of critics contend that a portion of the Pentateuch was written by Ezekiel, and, more incredible still, that large parts of it were written by Ezra. Nine years later, when Davidson was goaded into becoming a partisan rather than a critic, he endeavors to parry the force of the argument derived from "archaisms" in favor of the Mosaic age of the Pentateuch by exposing the extravagant claims of some of their advocates; but he says, "We do not say that there are no diversities of language between the Pentateuch and later books." The fact then remains that there is an *observable difference in the style of the Pentateuch from that of the later books, and indicating an earlier age.* And this is all that is claimed. The more or less diversity is of no vital importance.

Ewald, the great Hebraist, whose fanciful theory of five or six writers of different portions of the Pentateuch has not been accepted by critics, says, "These fragments," referring to the earliest, according to his classification, "display *many both rare and archaic peculiarities* in the usage of words"; and he gives several in a note, and remarks, "We find here, in proportion to the trifling bulk of the passages, *a great number of words* which are either wholly unknown elsewhere, or are not usual in prose." † But the same holds true of all the portions

* *Bib. Crit.*, Vol. I., pp. 15, 18.
† *His. of Is.*, Vol. I., p. 65.

or sections made by Ewald; and these peculiarities all disappear in the books following the Pentateuch, proving that a period of considerable length must have intervened between the close of its composition and that of those books. I cannot understand how Hebrew scholars can believe that the Pentateuch, so marked by its "archaisms," could have been written after Joshua — Kings (a large part of it even by Ezra), which are free from them; and these books were most certainly written before the middle of the captivity, most of them before its commencement, and some of them as early as or earlier than the time of David.

The *emphasis* with which Ewald characterizes the difference in the style of the Pentateuch and that of the rest of the books written before the captivity (Joshua — Kings) demands notice. "The first phenomenon," he says, "that strikes the observer here is the *marked* difference in the language [of these later books] in comparison with that of the preceding great book of the primitive history [the Pentateuch]. Although both are equally made up of passages by the most diverse writers, yet on the whole *each* is distinguished by a *peculiar* cast of language. Many fresh words and expressions become favorites here [in Joshua — Kings] and supplant their equivalents in the primitive history [Genesis — Deuteronomy]; others that are *thoroughly in vogue* here [in Joshua — Kings] are . . . avoided in the primitive history. But the *most remarkable and pervading characteristic* is that words of common life, which *never* occur to the pen of any single relater of the primitive history, find an *unquestioned* reception here [in Joshua — Kings]." "I have no hesitation in saying," he yet

more emphatically affirms, "that the *established usage of centuries* must have sanctioned for the primitive history [the Pentateuch] a style of narrative and a cast of language *utterly different* from those customary in the history of the Kings," in which Ewald includes Judges — Kings. They "naturally created a *new style* of narrative and of language."* The italics are mine. Ewald here affirms that for "centuries" the "primitive style" of the Pentateuch existed before the writers of the later books and literature lived. But we have good reason to believe that we have remains of literature as early as the time of David in some of the Psalms, to say nothing of the probability that the Book of Judges and portions of Samuel and all of Joshua may have been written in his reign or shortly after, in none of which are there any of the "archaisms and peculiarities of language" which are "*utterly different* from those customary" in Joshua — Kings, and constituting a "*new style* of narrative and language." But, according to the estimate of many modern critics, only about three centuries intervened between Moses and David or Solomon, and only about five, according to the earlier critics. Ewald's "usage of centuries" reaches back easily to the time of Moses in either chronology. To make as great a change in the language as he affirms, that length of time, in that age, would be required. The age of the Pentateuch is thrown back, therefore, to the time of Moses by the demand of its "*utterly different*" style from that of the later books. For this "archaic style tinges" *all the different documents* of which some critics think the work is composed, as Ewald admits "even Deuteronomy to be."†

* Vol. I., pp. 134, 135. † Page 135.

These opinions of eminent Hebrew scholars, with which nine-tenths of the scholars in this country who can read Hebrew agree, must suffice as proof of the "archaic style" of the Pentateuch. A popular essay like this is not the place for a minute exhibition and criticism of these "archaisms and peculiarities of language." A few specimens only will be given, as indications of their character, and illustrations of their number and variety, in which the common reader may be interested.

The most striking and obvious peculiarity in the style of the Pentateuch is the use of the same word for the singular pronoun in the third person of both genders, *he* and *she*. In the rest of the Hebrew writings, a distinction is always made and a different word is used for the feminine pronoun *she*. Ewald himself admits that "this is a proof which cannot be mistaken, in favor of the *high* antiquity of the Pentateuch." And when we remember that this pronoun is used nearly two hundred times in the Pentateuch, and, with but eleven exceptions, in the same form, the "proof" becomes decisive that the book is older than any other Hebrew writings which have come down to us; hence older even than the Psalms of David, in which no such "archaic" word is found. The same remark may be made respecting a word which in the Pentateuch is used *twenty-five* times, and is applied indifferently to either a young man or a young woman; while in the other Hebrew writings the feminine termination is added to distinguish the gender. A peculiar form of the plural demonstrative pronoun "these" is found in the Pentateuch. One phrase which indicates strongly the very early origin of the book is

that used to denote the death of an Israelite. He is said "to be gathered *to his people*"; while in the later writings he is said "to be gathered *to his fathers*." The nation not yet being settled in the land of promise, the "fathers" are not spoken of. A peculiar word is used in the Pentateuch to denote *species*, *kind*, of animals and plants twenty-eight times, and is *never* used in later writings, with but one exception, when Ezekiel (xlvii., 10) most obviously quotes the language of the Pentateuch, Genesis i., 21. A peculiar phrase is used twenty-one times to signify the relation of the sexes. Fourteen times a peculiar word is used for *lamb*. A peculiar word for *laugh* is used thirteen times, or rather a peculiar spelling of a word. A peculiar word is used fifty times for *goat* which is *never* used for that animal in the other books. A word is used for *female* twenty-one times in the Pentateuch, and never in the other writings except by Jeremiah (xxxi., 22), with evident reference to the old usage. *Nephesh* is used eighteen times for "creature" and but once elsewhere, Ezekiel xlvii., 9. Such is a specimen of the "archaic" words and phrases used in this book. Dr. Jahn, who made a special examination of these "archaisms," after omitting all words which treat of subjects peculiar to the Pentateuch, such as names of towns, villages, nations, men; of diseases and symptoms of diseases; of blemishes in sacrifices, priests, men, and women; of parts of the tabernacle, and its altars, curtains, and furniture,— in short, after the omission of *all* words which were used to signify things or ideas *not* spoken of in the later books,— found *over two hundred words, used from two to two hundred times each, which are peculiar*

*to the Pentateuch.** When we consider the meagre vocabulary of Hebrew words, this number is a very large one, and is conclusive evidence that the book was composed in a period remote from that in which the other Hebrew books were written. "The few solitary Chaldaisms which occur in the writings of the Golden Age," and which have been adduced as proof of the modern origin of the Pentateuch, Gesenius says, "may be accounted for by the fact that these books passed through the hands of copyists whose language was Chaldee." Besides, it is not certain that all these so called Chaldaisms are such. "Some of them are not found," says Gesenius, "in Chaldee, and seem to have belonged to the Hebrew popular dialect." †

Looking at the language only, therefore, we are required to refer the Pentateuch to an age as remote as that of Moses. It is objected, however, to this view of the age of the Pentateuch, that the language must have undergone a *greater* change between the

* Yet in the face of all this conscientious and scholarly discrimination, De Wette is rash enough and unjust enough to say that Jahn was utterly heedless and undiscriminating in his selection of words.

† The latest statement which I have seen respecting the language of the Pentateuch is contained in a notice of a *Historico-Critical Commentary on the Language of the Elohist in the Pentateuch* (by C. Victor Ryssel: 8vo, pp. 92; Leipzig, Fernan, 1878), in which it is said that "the result of the author's laborious examinations is that *only some parts* of the Books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, contain peculiarities of language which point to a *rather late* date of composition. These are the parts which, taken together, form the so-called Priest's Code. But the *greater* parts of the Elohistic book, and the weightiest, *i.e.*, the historic and the supreme laws, are to be referred to the *early* days of the literature of the Israelite people." Of the ability of this scholar to decide on this subject, I have no knowledge. Accepting his decision as correct respecting the fact of "certain peculiarities of language" in the ritual which "point to a rather late date of composition," this would be expected; for ritual language survives all other, and would be used, when ritualistic matters were treated of, long centuries after the ritual was composed and adopted.

Mosaic Age, in which it is claimed that the Pentateuch was written, and the age in which the remaining books, Joshua — Kings, were written, than we find that it has undergone in these books. If, however, Joshua and Judges and a portion of Samuel were written in the age of David or Solomon, as is most probable, only about three hundred years intervened between their composition and that of the Pentateuch, according to the most commonly received chronology; and, setting their composition as late as that of the Books of the Kings, but about seven hundred years separate them. Now, it is well known that the early Oriental languages do not change as rapidly as those in modern days. The late George H. Smith, the eminent Assyriologist, says:* "The texts of Rim-agu, Sargon, Hammurali, who were one thousand years before Nebuchadnezzar and Nabonidus, show the same language as the texts of these later kings, there being no sensible difference in style to match the long interval between them." These older texts were of the age of Moses, according to the old chronology, and just as much time elapsed between their composition and the later texts as elapsed between the time of Moses and the captivity, when the Books of the Kings were written; but, according to the new chronology, the text of Rim-agu is three hundred years older than that of the Pentateuch.

The Egyptologists also testify to the slight changes which took place in the early centuries in the language of Egypt. In the *Revue Archéologique* (1867, unless my reference is incorrect) is the following statement: "In comparing the demotic papyrus with the romance of

* Vol. II., p. 23.

the Two Brothers, even a superficial examination shows, not only that the language and the formulæ of the two papyri, separated from each other by an interval of some thousand years, are of the same kind, but also — a point of most special interest — even the grammar has not undergone the least change." Well might there not have been any greater change in the Hebrew language of the time of Moses down to the time of the captivity than we find when we compare the language of the Pentateuch and that of the Books of the Kings. There is a change, and as great as we should expect to find under the circumstances, as great as the analogy of other Oriental languages would lead us to anticipate.

The language of the Pentateuch is "archaic"; signally different from the earliest of the other writings, and some of these date back to the time of David. The time between Moses and David was none too great to have wrought this difference. Governed by the language of the work, we must date the Pentateuch as early as the Mosaic Age.

Nor can it be said with any ground of reason that this "archaic language" in the Pentateuch is only the "priestly idiom" which was used by the priestly forgers, Hilkiah and Ezra; for there is no proof that there was any "priestly idiom." And, more than this, the writings of the priests which have come down to us contain none of these "archaic peculiarities." Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Ezra, Haggai, Zechariah, all priests, write in the degenerate language of the age of the captivity, and use none of the "archaic" words which distinguish the language of the Pentateuch from all the other books. This they would not have done, had these peculiar words been the special vocabulary of priestly men.

Before dismissing a consideration of the language of the Pentateuch, as furnishing an argument for its antiquity, it is necessary to consider an objection to this conclusion which has been drawn from the marked diversity of style in the books themselves. A sufficient reply to this objection, so far as my argument is concerned, is that, however diverse the style of the different parts of these books may be, the style of *all these parts* is "archaic," and hence they were written long before Joshua — Kings. But I cannot admit that such diversities of style as the objection implies are found in the Pentateuch. Excepting the first eleven chapters of Genesis, which contain some notices of the world before the time of Abraham, and excepting several passages in the remainder of Genesis, there is a unity of style as clearly marked as in any writing by even one person, spread over as long a period (forty years) and including as many different subjects, to say nothing of the probability of the employment of scribes who would naturally write in different styles while using the same "archaic language." I have gone through the drudgery of examining all De Wette's divisions founded upon what he is pleased to call diversities of style, and have risen from the task entirely satisfied that there is no good foundation for any such wide diversities as he maintains are to be found, making it possible with any degree of certainty to identify the different writers. The self-contradictory nature of some of the rules by which he professes to be governed, the different words which in different sections he quotes as proving the identity of the authorship of some sections and the different authorship of other sections, are sufficient to lead

the student to suspect that a mistake has been made in this portion of his Introduction ; and upon further and closer examination he will find his suspicions changed into firm conclusions that such heterogeneousness of style, as is affirmed so decidedly to exist, is not to be found in these books. But we will not be allured much further from a positive consideration of our subject by the fruitful field of criticism which opens before us in this direction.

A very brief space only must be taken to illustrate the fatuity of all such attempts to cull out the parts which are attributed to the different hypothetical writers. I use De Wette's fragments, who confesses to following "Stähelin's plan." Did De Wette test this plan by comparing it with the text? It does not seem possible. He says Exodus xvi. is from the Elohist writer, yet God is called *Elohim* but once and *Jehovah* twenty-two times. Chapter xx., 19–21, is Jehovistic, and yet God is called Elohim three times and not once Jehovah. Leviticus iii., 6, is called Elohistic, yet God is called Jehovah. These are selected as Elohistic, yet God is called Jehovah in all of them: Leviticus vi., 18; vii., 20, 21; x., 15, used twice. Leviticus xiv., Jehovah is used twenty-three times, Elohim once. Leviticus i.–iii., Jehovah twenty-nine times, Elohim once; xvii., 4–10, Jehovah seven times, Elohim not once; xix., 8, 34, Jehovah in each; xxii., 3, Jehovah twice; xxiv., 16, 22, Jehovah in both; xxvii., 9, 11, 16, 21, 22, 28, Jehovah eight times and Elohim not once in these later references. Let us look into Numbers i.–x.: Jehovah is used ninety-nine times, Elohim *once!* xviii., Jehovah sixteen times, Elohim not once; xx., 1–13, Jehovah

seven times, Elohim once; xxv., 1–18, Jehovah six times, Elohim once. These are sufficient illustrations of the complete unreliableness of this attempt to parcel out these books, Exodus — Numbers, among different authors on this use of the names of God. Further exposure was made of the attempt in the Review of Kuenen, p. 71.*

*The utter futility of all attempts to separate the Levitical or priestly parts of the middle books, Exodus — Numbers, from the rest of the writing, will be best understood by the reader from the disagreements of the scholars who have attempted to separate them. I will give the parts selected by Nöldeke, as quoted by Prof. Smith, pp. 432, 433, and as selected by Stähelin, as quoted in Parker's De Wette, Vol. II., pp. 106–130.

For greater ease in comparing them, I will tabulate their selections. The verses selected are often not connected.

Exodus,	chapter	i.,	Nöldeke	9	verses;	Stähelin	22
"	"	ii.,	"	2½	"	"	3
"	"	vi.,	"	27	"	"	30
"	"	vii.,	"	15½	"	"	7
"	"	viii.,	"	7½	"	"	0
"	"	ix.,	"	5	"	"	0
"	"	xi.,	"	2	"	"	0
"	"	xii.,	"	37	"	"	42
"	"	xiii.,	"	3	"	"	4
"	"	xiv.,	"	15 3-2	"	"	0
"	"	xv.,	"	2½	"	"	0
"	"	xvi.,	"	36	"	"	15
"	"	xvii.,	"	16	"	"	0
"	"	xix.,	"	2	"	"	0
"	"	xx.–xxiv.,	"	3	"	"	118*
"	"	xxvi.–xxxi., 17	"	all	"	"	all
"	"	xxxv.–xl.,	"	all	"	"	all
Leviticus,	"	i.–xxvi., 2	"	all but 48	"	"	all
"	"	xxvii.,	"	all	"	"	all†
Numbers,	"	i.–viii., 22	"	all	"	"	4 verses more
"	"	ix.–x., 28	"	all	"	"	9 verses more
"	"	xiii.,	"	19 3-2	"	"	all

* De Wette and Parker differ from both Noldeke and Stahelin and from each other.
† Parker utterly objects to both.

I cannot close this already extended discussion of the "archaic language" of the Pentateuch as proof of its high antiquity, without saying that my reading of the Hebrew and my examination of the discussion of the eminent critics quoted above compel me to make *three* periods of the language of the Old Testament Scriptures: The first covering the Pentateuch; the second, Joshua — Kings; the third, Chronicles — Esther. The poetical books belonging to the second and third periods can be nearly as easily distinguished as the historical.

Numbers,	chapter	xiv.,	Nöldeke	23	verses;	Stähelin	all
"	"	xvi.,	"	73-2	"	"	all
"	"	xvii.-xix.,	"	all	"	"	confused
"	"	xx.,	"	18½	"	"	confused
"	"	xxi.,	"	2½	"	"	0
"	"	xxii.,	"	1	"	"	0
"	"	xxv.,	"	18	"	"	0
"	"	xxvi.,	"	53½	"	"	65
"	"	xxvii.,	"	all	"	"	all
"	"	xxviii.,	"	0	"	"	all
"	"	xxix.,	"	0	"	"	all
"	"	xxx.,	"	14	"	"	16
"	"	xxxi.,	"	all	"	"	all
"	"	xxxii.,	"	23½	"	"	32
"	"	xxxiii.,	"	50	"	"	49
"	"	xxxiv.-xxxvi.,	"	all	"	"	all

Decided dissent is expressed by both De Wette and Parker from many of these selections, which I did not think it necessary to note. Prof. Smith says, "Nöldeke's table is generally accepted as careful and *correct in essentials*." De Wette says, "Stähelin's is, as a whole, *certainly correct!*" The italics are mine. Comment is unnecessary. But that the reader may see what this table does not show, the *manner* in which these verses are selected by Nöldeke, I will give a few specimens as furnishing farther proof of the imaginary line which separates the verses chosen and the verses left. Exodus i., 1–5, 7, 13, 14; ii., 23, 24, 25; xiii., 1, 2, 20; xii., 1–23, 28, 37, 40–51; xi., 9, 10; Numbers xvi., 1, half of 2, 3–11, 16–23, part of 24, 26, 27, 35; xxxii., 2 (3?), 4–6, 16–32, part of 33, 40. These specimens must suffice. Any reader can turn to the Bible, and judge whether there is any ground for selecting just these passages. I have no fear of the result. *See* Note A, p. 231.

SECTION II. EVIDENCE FROM CONTENTS AND STRUCTURE.

Were there, therefore, no other evidence of the age of the composition of the Pentateuch, its archaic language would be sufficient to determine it. But there is other evidence corroborative of this, and also adding its own independent weight to the same conclusion. This evidence is found in the *contents* and *structure* of the books of the Pentateuch, and determines their age as certainly and as evidently as the contents and structure of the rocks determine their age. The contents and structure of the Silurian rocks no more surely prove their deposition to have been before the Devonian than the contents and structure of the Pentateuch prove it to have been written before any other books in the Bible.

Another internal argument in favor of the antiquity of the Pentateuch is found in the *journal-like* character of the work itself. It is in precisely the form it would have been in, had it been written under the circumstances commonly believed to exist at the time of its composition. It is fragmentary and abrupt, relating incidents in such a manner and form as to induce the belief that the writer was on the spot and narrated what he saw, and his own feelings under the circumstances. To fully appreciate this characteristic of the Pentateuch, or the last four books of it, we must go into particulars, which will show very clearly that they were composed on the spot where the transactions recorded transpired.

I. I will first refer to the occurrence of *unexpected difficulties* which arose, making it necessary to amend or

repeal laws which had been previously enacted. A marked instance of this nature occurs respecting the law of inheritance in accordance with which none but *sons* could inherit the real estate of the father; and specific regulations were made respecting the manner in which it should be divided. But, when the tribes were about to enter upon possession of the promised land, the daughters of Zelophehad came forward, and stated that their father had left no sons at his death, and therefore that their father's portion of the land would go out of the family. They pray, therefore, that a possession may be given them among their brethren. To meet this emergency, Moses enacts a new, or rather amends the old, law. He enacts that, "if a man die and have no son, then ye shall cause his inheritance to pass unto his daughter." And farther provisions are made in case no daughter should survive (Numbers xxvii., 1–11). If we turn forward nine chapters, we shall find that this new law was found to be as defective as the old one, but in another direction. It was the intention of Moses that no part of the inheritance of one tribe should pass into the possession of another tribe. But these daughters of Zelophehad were proposing to marry into another tribe,— not into that to which their father belonged. This caused the children of the other families of the tribe to make complaint to Moses that his amendment to the old law, which gave the inheritance to the sons only, and giving it, in case of no sons, to the daughters, would disinherit their *tribe* of a part of their estate, since these daughters of Zelophehad were about to marry out of the tribe, and thus take their father's inheritance with them. Moses

saw the conflicting nature of both the original law and his amendment, and he *amended the amendment* by enacting that, in all cases, "every daughter that possesseth an inheritance in any tribe of the children of Israel shall be wife unto one of the family of the tribe of her father, that the children of Israel may enjoy every man the inheritance of his fathers." Let, therefore, the daughters of Zelophehad "marry to whom they think best; only to the family of the tribe of their fathers shall they marry" (Numbers xxxvi.). Thus, after *three* experiments, the law is perfected, and the details of the cause of these changes are given *as if written on the spot.* Would a compiler of the laws of the Hebrews in the time of Ezra have thus stated this matter? It is very improbable, not to say incredible.

Another incident is related, showing the imperfect character of the first enactment, and how, from time to time, laws were added to meet these new emergencies. A man was found violating the Sabbath by picking up sticks (Numbers xv., 32). The law had forbidden all work. A man is found violating the law: *how* is he to be punished? Moses adds a new section to the law containing the penalty for violating the Sabbath. Stone him with stones without the camp. Here we see clearly that a history of the origin of the penalty is given, which would not have been given by a compiler of a later age. The same is true of the law against blasphemy (Leviticus xxiv., 10–23) to be noticed soon.

The change which was made in the law respecting *usury* indicates the journal-like character of the Pentateuch. It is first enacted (Exodus xxii., 25) that no usury shall be taken of the *poor*, as it would be oppressive;

but it is distinctly implied that it might be taken of the rich. Just as the tribes were to enter Canaan, thirty-eight years after, we find that this law is so modified as to forbid the taking of usury from *any* Hebrew (Deuteronomy xxiii., 19). It had been found, probably, that very little money would be loaned to the poor without usury, when it could be loaned to the rich with usury. *All usury of Hebrews is therefore now forbidden.* But another curious change is found in these usury laws respecting strangers who came to dwell among the Hebrews. Soon after the people left Egypt, it was enacted that no usury should be taken of the poor of their own people, but of the poor of other people who had come among them nothing is said. In about two years, just before the people leave Sinai, a more stringent law is passed respecting usury (Leviticus xxv., 35); and strangers are included in it, and especially those who had been overtaken by calamity and had lost their property. Just before entering Canaan (Deuteronomy xxiii., 19), we find that the law forbidding usury when loans were made to sojourners and strangers is repealed. It is very easy to see why a writer on the spot should insert all these particulars; but it is not easy to see why a later writer giving a compend of the law should have inserted all these minute matters, or indeed how he could have known them unless some one had written them at the time, and the later writer had used his journal. The old law was found upon trial to be imperfect: an amendment was enacted, and inserted in the book containing the legislative proceedings, as is done at this day.

An unforeseen difficulty arose respecting the passover

(Leviticus xxiii., 1). *Every* Israelite was bound by the original law to keep the passover on the *fourteenth* day of the *first* month, and a heavy penalty rested upon him who failed to obey it. Yet it was equally perilous for a person ritually unclean to minister in any sacred rite. In Numbers ix., we have the record of such a conflict in the laws. "Certain men who were defiled by the dead body of a man," so that they could not keep the passover, came to Moses and Aaron and inquired what they should do. Moses saw the conflict in the laws, and enacted that they, and all persons who should hereafter be in their situation, might eat the passover on the *fourteenth* day of the *second* month, regarding, at the same time, all the ceremonies which were required of those who ate it in the previous month.

A long series of amendments is found in Deuteronomy to adapt laws, many of which were designed for a camp and nomadic life, to the settled, agricultural condition of the people in Canaan. In camp, they were required to kill their animals for food at the tabernacle, that the priests might see that no idolatrous rites were performed with the blood and entrails: in the land of their inheritance, they could kill animals for food at their own homes. Tents were to be exchanged for houses, and laws respecting their construction and purification are enacted.

A difficulty arose respecting the penalty to be inflicted on one of that "mixed" race which came out of Egypt with Israel. A son of an Israelitish woman and of a man of Egypt had a fray, blasphemed and cursed. He is kept in ward till his case could be inquired into,

and it is at last determined, after careful inquiry, that he should be put to death as an Israelite must be who had committed the same crime (Leviticus xxiv., 10–23). Such changes, additions, and amendments in the laws, made to meet emergencies apparently unforeseen, most certainly indicate a writer on the spot, and not a historian of remotely succeeding generations.

II. But this Book of Deuteronomy and the light which it throws upon the age of the Pentateuch demand a thorough examination, as so much misapprehension exists concerning both.

Dr. Kuenen affirms that the forger of Deuteronomy *intended to deceive the people*, and that "men used to perpetrate such fictions without any qualms of conscience."* De Wette says: "The author of Deuteronomy would have us regard his whole book as the work of Moses" (Parker's *De Wette*, Vol. II., p. 159). Davidson says, "A late writer represents the whole of Deuteronomy, or at least chapters iv., 44–xxx., as proceeding from Moses' hand." . . . "The deception was an innocent one, being merely a veil or *form* for communicating and enforcing lessons of importance!" Indeed, all supporters of this theory admit that Deuteronomy is a *flagrant forgery*. Yet they are compelled to admit, also, that the writer had before him many older documents containing laws ancient and venerated. I propose to show how the laws given at Sinai, forty years before, were amended on the east bank of the Jordan by the original law-giver, and thus prove by its contents that the address of Moses is not a "fiction" written eight centuries later, but a substan-

* Vol. II., p. 18.

tially correct report of a real transaction. In Deuteronomy xii.–xxvi., we have a series of additions and amendments to previous laws, *all based upon new circumstances or defects discovered in the original enactment*, none of them affecting the fundamental law of the nation. It would require more space than I can take, and more patience in the reader than can be assumed, to quote or refer to all the changes made and the reasons for them; nor is it necessary for my argument to do so. A few must suffice as indicating the rest. I give the following as average illustrations of all of them: Permission is given to the people to kill animals at their own homes instead of at the door of the tabernacle. Secretly enticing to idolatry is made a capital crime. Idolatrous cities are to be razed to the ground. Mourners are not to shave between the eyes. A dead carcass may be sold to an alien. The animals that may be eaten are named. When the distance is "too great to carry the tithe of corn and wine and oil and the firstlings of thy herds and flocks" to the place which God shall choose, "then thou shalt turn it into money" to use at the place chosen. Payment of debts is not to be enforced in the Sabbatical year from the poor. Slaves are to be emancipated on the seventh year. Female slaves are to have the same rights as males: they are to be provided for, when bearing, by their master. Judges are to be appointed in all cities. Regulations are made respecting a king. An addition is made to a priest's perquisites. A test of a false prophet is given. Minute regulations are made respecting cities of refuge. Landmarks are not to be changed. Two witnesses are to be required for "any

iniquity" as well as for "murder." A false witness is to be punished as the criminal, if guilty, would be. Regulations are given for drafting soldiers for war. Trees are not to be destroyed when besieging cities. The treatment of a town in case of uncertain murder is described. Conditions of marrying a female captive are given, etc. There are over *sixty amendments and additions* to the law as contained in Exodus — Numbers, in these chapters, and they are such as one having the original laws before him would, under the circumstances, have made; but it appears incredible that one having the laws of Deuteronomy before him could have composed those of Exodus — Numbers, as the theory assumes.

Again, the indirect quotations of the original laws and references to them contained in Exodus — Numbers, by the speaker in Deuteronomy, in connection with the amendments and additions which he makes, are of such a kind as to compel the belief that Exodus — Numbers were in the hand of the speaker; at any rate, they raise a violent presumption that these books were already written, and their contents well known to the Deuteronomist.

In about a dozen places, the speaker in Deuteronomy quotes from what God "had commanded" or "said," and his quotation or reference is found in the previous books. In some instances, the quotations are verbal; in others, free, but including a peculiar word or phrase, as not to "lift up" an iron tool on building an altar (Deuteronomy xxvii., 5=Exodus xx., 26); to drive out the Canaanites "little by little" (Deuteronomy vii., 22=Exodus xxiii., 30); God is a "jealous God"

(Deuteronomy iv., 24=Exodus xx., 5); thou shalt not wear a garment of "divers sorts" (Deuteronomy xxii., 11=Leviticus xix., 9). Some of these words and phrases are used only in the passages quoted. These quotations are sufficient to indicate the character of the rest of the passages, and the reader can judge of their weight in this argument. To an unbiassed critic who had no theory to support, they alone would seem to be decisive of the whole question. But lest some readers should still hesitate to accept this conclusion on the testimony of these passages, I will trespass upon the patience of others by quoting a few more passages which must remove the least shadow of doubt. In Deuteronomy i., 16–18, Moses says the "judges shall not respect persons in judgment, but ye shall hear the small as well as great, and judge righteously between every man and his brother. . . . I *commanded you at that time* ['whilst at Horeb'] all the things which ye should do." In Leviticus xix., 15, is the original law. In Deuteronomy iii., 18, Moses says, addressing the tribes which were to settle on the east side of Jordan, "I *commanded you at that time*, saying, Ye shall pass over armed before your brethren," and help them subdue the land first. This command is in Numbers xxxii., 20–23. In Deuteronomy xi., 22–25, in order to encourage the people to go up and take the land, Moses reminds them that the "Lord *hath said* that he will drive out all these nations from before you." This saying of the Lord is in Exodus xxiii., 27–29. In Deuteronomy xviii., 2, he says, "The tribe of Levi . . . shall have no inheritance among their brethren; the Lord is their inheritance, *as*

he hath said unto them"; and he said it in Numbers xviii., 20. In Deuteronomy xx., 17, Moses repeats the "command of the Lord" contained in Exodus xxxiv., 11, to drive out or exterminate the "Hittites and the Amorites, the Canaanites and the Perizzites, the Hivites and the Jebusites," from the land. In Deuteronomy xxiv., 8, Moses directs the people "to take heed in the plague of leprosy to observe diligently and do according to all that the priests the Levites shall teach you: as I *commanded* these, so ye shall observe to do." This "command" is found in Leviticus xiii., 14.*

* A writer in the *Unitarian Review*, October, 1880, p. 303, after reciting the stoning of Achan's children, with their father, for his sin, and the hanging of seven of Saul's sons for the sin of Saul in slaying the Gibeonites, says, "If they had had the law of Deuteronomy, 'The children shall not be put to death for the father,'" Joshua would not "have killed Achan's innocent children," nor David "have hanged the seven innocent sons of Saul." Perhaps they were no better interpreters of the Law of Moses than the Supreme Court of the United States, headed by the profound Chief Justice Taney, when he said, "The negroes had no rights which a white man was bound to respect"; and, possibly, the apparent conflict of laws may have puzzled the poorly educated jurists, Joshua and David, for the so-called ten tables announced that their God was "a jealous God, *visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth* generation of them that hate him." If, under the light of the nineteenth century, the highest court in the United States could announce such an opinion as Chief Justice Taney's, may not Joshua have been mistaken three thousand years before? More remarkable still, two *opposite decisions* were made by the same court within about a year, touching a more vital point in the Constitution,—the constitutionality of the legal-tender law raising paper money to an equality with gold. Different interpretations of a law are so far from proving that there is no law that they prove its existence past all question.

It may not be inapposite to remind the reader that different interpretations are very frequently given of law by different administrations, and that laws for generations obsolete or remaining unenforced are revived and enforced, as just at this time the English law of eviction, which has been obsolete for two centuries, is being enforced in Ireland, or as an old law of Maryland has just been discovered, which requires the tongue of a Unitarian, one who denies the Trinity, to be bored through with an iron, which never was enforced and whose existence surprises the present generation.

He also objects that two different reasons would not have been given for keeping

But I must refrain from quoting further. Reasonable readers have rights which unreasonable ones are bound to respect. If these passages are not conclusive and do not remove the last shadow of a reasonable doubt, then the presence and testimony of Moses himself could not dispel it. The author of Deuteronomy was familiar with the preceding books, or historical questions are incapable of settlement.

So evident are these references, and so numerous, that even Dr. Davidson admits that "it is possible that the *successive laws* may have been given by Moses,

the Sabbath in Deuteronomy v. and Exodus xx. by the so-called Originist, the former because of release from Egyptian bondage, the latter because of God's rest from creating. But would the Originist writing *after* the Deuteronomist, with whose reason he was familiar and the people also, and which would be so pleasant to them, have given another and obviously much less touching and humane reason?

The same writer affirms that Deuteronomy and the historical books take a wholly different view of the sacerdotal tribe and the priesthood from Exodus — Numbers (*Unitarian Review*, p. 307). He says that in Joshua — Kings the restriction to sacrifice to the family of Aaron is unknown. This objection has been fully answered in the text. In some cases the law may have been violated by supposed necessity, in others priests may have been officiators, but not named. *Quid facit per alium facit per se;* and so far is it from being true, as this writer affirms, that Ezekiel is the parent of the priestly legislation, that he is perpetually referring to and quoting the laws relating to sacrifices already in existence, as I have most fully illustrated.

The same writer affirms in italics, on page 305, that the "Deuteronomist is unacquainted with the Book of Origins," or the main portion of the other books of the Pentateuch, and appeals to Deuteronomy xii., 8, and Leviticus xiv., 8, 9, to prove it. In Deuteronomy, referring to the change in their condition consequent on the people's passing over Jordan, the writer says, "Ye shall not do after all the things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes," — that is, regarding the law as best you can in your migratory condition. But, in Leviticus, the Originist, so called, says that he who regardeth not the law of sacrifice referred to "shall be cut off from among his people." But if the Originist wrote *after* the Deuteronomist, as is maintained, would he have written that it was a law given on the mount to Moses by Jehovah, when the Deuteronomist had written that there was no such law in existence according to these interpreters?

from the first code at Sinai till the time of his death in Moab; the legislation being supplemented, enlarged, modified, altered as circumstances arose."* And he also admits, respecting Deuteronomy, that "it is possible indeed to conceive of Moses, provided he wrote the preceding books of the Pentateuch, giving a survey of the historical circumstances through which he had passed at the head of the Israelites, and modifying or abrogating such enactments as would be unsuitable to the people when they had obtained possession of the promised land." † "There is no doubt," he says, "that it [Deuteronomy] is built on the historical facts embodied in the former parts of the Pentateuch. It alludes to them throughout. Yet it is still possible . . . that his [the author's] acquaintance with them may have been borrowed from *oral tradition.*" But, only two pages further on, Dr. Davidson says: "These proofs [filling three pages] of the Deuteronomist's acquaintance with the four preceding books might be multiplied, since *almost every chapter* presents some indication, however slight, that *written* documents were employed by him." ‡ Now pass on seven pages further, and we find Dr. Davidson saying, "The Deuteronomist found the first four books *made up in their present form* of two or more leading documents, and terminating with Moses' death." Comment on such criticism is unnecessary. Dr. Kuenen, who maintains that the chief portion of Exodus — Numbers was not composed till two centuries *after* Deuteronomy, must settle the matter as he can with Dr. Davidson, who affirms that the "four books," Genesis

* Vol. I., p. 75. † Vol. I., p. 253.
‡ Vol. I., pp. 386, 387. The italics are mine.

— Numbers, "in their present form," were in the hands of the Deuteronomist.

III. Another evidence of the time and place and manner of writing these books and enacting these laws is found in Deuteronomy xxviii.–xxx. compared with Leviticus xxvi. At the conclusion of the residence at Sinai, when the code and ritual had been given, Moses exhorts the people, Leviticus xxvi., to obedience, as they were soon to be settled in the promised land, by all the motives which could influence a patriotic and religious people. He pictures before them all the blessings of peace and all the luxuries of prosperity consequent upon obedience, and all the desolations of war and the horrors of famine and plague which will follow disobedience. It was as natural as fit that then and there such an earnest and ardent and admonitory address should be made. But the people did not enter the land as was expected. They wandered about for thirty-eight years, till nearly all who heard the address had forgotten it or were dead. We are not surprised, therefore, to find, as the people were about to enter the land after their long wanderings, and as their great leader could not pass over with them, that he again addresses them at even greater length and with supreme earnestness. The same principles are clothed in more glowing language, and are warmed with a patriot's anxiety and importunity. The time, the circumstances, give coloring to the words spoken. Accept the historical account as correct, and both speeches find their place and justification. Deny the reliableness of the history, and either the one or the other of the speeches is superfluous, and its origin can-

not be accounted for, nor the location of the one in the Book of Leviticus justified. The internal evidence of the age and origin of the Pentateuch, derived from the construction, contents, and repeated references to the other books, and the amendments and repeal of laws contained in them, the enactment of new laws demanded by the changed conditions of the people, as exhibited in Deuteronomy, would of itself justify the belief of the Mosaic Age of these books.

But there is more evidence of the same kind contained in the description of the condition of the people, and the enactment of new laws, and the amendment of old ones, thirty-seven years before, when the people were about to enter Canaan from Kadesh, as written in the Book of Numbers to which we must now turn our attention.*

IV. The fourteenth chapter of Numbers closes apparently the account of the residence of the people at Kadesh after the repulse of the revolutionary attempt to force their way into Canaan. No further account is given of them till they appear again at Kadesh in the desert of Zin, thirty-seven years afterwards. Of this period, we know nothing except the list of stations where they encamped, given in the thirty-third chapter, and the modified or new laws, given in chapters xv.–xix., including the rebellion of Korah. I propose now to examine these chapters to see what light they throw upon the age and authorship of the Pentateuch.

These regulations were made with express reference to

*A writer in the *Unitarian Review*, October, 1880, page 302, says: "The Deuteronomist could not have known the Levitical law as we now have it. . . . He flatly contradicts many of its most positive statements." The repeal of some of the old laws and the enactment of different ones, as shown above, rather proves a familiarity with them.

the wants of people when settled in the promised land, and when they were supposed to be about to enter it. "When ye come into the land of your habitations," says Moses, you will regard the following laws. As the history records, it was supposed by Moses as well as by the people that they were to enter at once upon their inheritance; and therefore he had so improved the original code as to better adapt it to their new condition. There is no reason to suppose he would have made these additions and amendments, as recorded in the fifteenth chapter, now, if he had known they were to be wanderers in the wilderness one generation, or thirty-seven years longer. The history implies the reason why these laws were made *then*, and the implication of immediate entrance "into their habitations" contained in the publication of such laws confirms the authenticity of the history, and shows the journal-like style of the work. The fifteenth chapter was written evidently *before* the repulse took place, and the rebellion was punished by the denial of that generation to enter the land.

Do the laws themselves, as compared with other laws, throw any light upon the origin of these books? Chapter xv., 1–16, extends the regulation respecting strangers at the passover to all the sacrificial ritual, as if the people were to be so situated that strangers would be very likely to join them more frequently than they had done before; and, most obviously, strangers would be more numerous when they were settled in the land. Again, the quantity of flour and oil and wine is specified for each offering of a lamb or of a ram or of a bullock, as if there would be hereafter no lack of flour and oil and wine as there was in the desert, when the quantity

for an offering was not specified (Leviticus ii.),—indicating that they were about to change a nomadic for an agricultural life.

Numbers xv., 17–21. This law of the "heave offering" of a "cake of the first of the dough," with grain taken from the "*threshing floor*," is *new*, and implies that they were soon to be husbandmen. No such ceremony of thankfulness could have been observed in the desert.

Numbers xv., 22–29. "A kid of the goats" is added to the sin-offering for sins of ignorance of the congregation (Leviticus iv., 13–21). The cause of this addition does not appear. But emphasis is laid on the obligation of "the stranger that sojourneth" with them to obey this law, as if more such persons would be likely to be among them. This is new. Numbers xv., 30–36. The presumptuous sinner is to "be cut off from among his people"; and a case of such presumptuous violation of the law of observing the Sabbath is brought before Moses, and he decides that the *form* of "cutting off from the people," or that capital punishment, shall be stoning. This law and the form of the penalty are both *new*.

Numbers xv., 37–41. The law requiring the wearing of "fringes on the borders of their garments" is *new*. This law, unlike the others, does not include "strangers," as it indicates race. There is nothing in either this law or the one before to indicate the time in which they were made; but their connection with the others raises a strong presumption that they were enacted at the same time, and *before* the repulse on "the hill even unto Hormah" and the rebellion of Korah.

Numbers xvi. contains an account of the rebellion of Korah and Dathan and Abiram and On,— the first a Levite, the other three Reubenites. That a second rebellion should have sprung up just at this time among the chief men, since Moses and Aaron had failed to take them into the promised land and were about to lead them back into the desert, is very credible. They gave as a justification for their rebellion the very plausible, not to say satisfactory, reason that Moses and Aaron had taken too much upon themselves, as the recent great reverses and the sufferings of the great and terrible wilderness journeyings threatened showed. Reuben was the eldest son, and Judah the fourth: why should not the children of Reuben lead in the march, and command instead of being placed behind Judah, as second in rank? Korah was a descendant of an *elder* son of Kohath than Elzaphan, who had been made "chief of the families of the Kohathites," and was cousin of Moses and Aaron, and might well aspire, after such disasters and such prospects, to a higher place. The time and circumstances correspond with the insurrection, and are its sufficient reason. The rebellion was nipped in the bud by the destruction of the leaders in a marvellous manner, and the right of Aaron to be the head of the priesthood is vindicated by the budding of his rod when all the other rods of the tribes budded not (chap. xvii.). Then follows, in chapter xviii., a repetition of many of the laws respecting the priesthood, with additions and changes, and a special charge to Aaron respecting his official duties and perquisites as distinguished from the Levites. These laws settled the questions in dispute between

the Kohathites and the priests, Aaron and his sons. In verse 8, the "anointing" of the priests is spoken of, referring to the law which is recorded in Leviticus viii., 30. It is announced (chap. xviii., 12, 13) that the "first-fruits" should be given to Aaron, which is new; verse 14, every devoted thing is given to Aaron (Leviticus xxvii., 28), also new; verse 13, redeemed firstlings are to be Aaron's (Exodus xxxiv., 9), new.

Chapter xviii., 20, informs us that Aaron (the priesthood) should "have no inheritance in the land" as the Levites did, which is *new;* but the Levites must give a tenth part of their tithe to the priesthood (verses 26, 28). In this manner, all future dispute about the income of the priests is avoided. That this special legislation should have taken place at this critical time is strong evidence of the substantial accuracy of the history. And the legislation without the history would be strong evidence that something very important had transpired in the camp to render it necessary.

The nineteenth chapter contains a minute account of the preparation and use of the water of purification for any one who had been made unclean by contact with a dead body; the water to be used with the ashes of a red heifer. The *occasion* of this law is found in the plague, recorded in the sixteenth chapter, which carried off many thousands of the people. The whole ceremony was a most vigorous and efficient health law, and being enacted at this particular time corroborates the history.

All these laws indicate *special causes* for their enactment, and justify the belief that these chapters (xv.–xix.) were written at the time the people were

encamped near Kadesh,— the xv., before their repulse, when they were soon expecting to enter the promised land, and the xvi. – xix., after that repulse. For farther evidence of the truth of these accounts, the reader is referred to *Undesigned Coincidences*, where the subject of Korah's rebellion is more fully examined.

V. After the wanderings in the wilderness were over and the people were encamped near Jordan, we find Moses giving more directions to the people, some entirely new, some modifications of previous laws. Let us see if there is anything in these directions or laws which will throw light upon the time and cause of their enactment, or anything in the condition of the people which will account for these laws being given at this particular time.

In Numbers xxviii., 1–8, the daily offering is spoken of, required in Exodus xxix., 38–42; and there is added to the original law the following amendment: "In the holy place shalt thou cause the strong wine to be poured." Both the place and the kind of wine are new. The original word for wine is translated in Leviticus x., 9, "strong drink." If it means "old wine," as the rabbins say, it implies that they were soon to be settled where they could keep wine till it was old, which they had not been able to do before. And the command to pour it "in the holy place" indicates that they might be tempted when settled in the land, by remoteness, to pour it elsewhere. Numbers xxviii., 4, and Exodus xxix., 39, are in the same words, showing that the writer of Numbers was familiar with the old law.

Numbers xxxviii., 9, 10. The Sabbath-day offering of

two lambs is new, and implies that they would be so situated that their flocks would permit such a draft on them, and also distinguish that day from other days.

Numbers xxviii., 11–15. These new-moon offerings are *new*, and also imply an increase of their herds and flocks and vintage and olive-trees and grain, to justify another festival of their own nation at the time of the idolatrous festival of other nations, and thus secure them from joining their neighbors in idolatrous rites.

In chapter xxviii., 16–25, the proper manner of keeping the passover is described. In Leviticus xxiii., 5–8, no particulars are given. Verses 19–23 in Numbers are new. The animals, bullocks, and lambs to be offered in sacrifice on each of the seven days are *specified:* fourteen bullocks, forty-nine lambs, and seven goats in all. This free use of animals certainly indicates a larger supply at hand than they had previously had.

Numbers xxviii., 26–31. The description of "the day of first-fruits" differs in no important particular from that in Leviticus xxiii., 19–21. There is no obvious reason why it should have been inserted here, except that it was intimately connected with the new moon and passover.

Numbers xxix., 1–6, prescribes the sacrifices which are to be offered at the feast of trumpets, which is not done in Leviticus xxiii., 24, 25. This again shows clearly that flocks and herds would be more numerous, as they certainly would be as soon as they had settled in the promised land.

Numbers xxix., 7–11, describes the services of the holy convocation on the great day of atonement, and prescribes the sacrifices which must be offered, of which nothing is said in Leviticus xxiii., 26–32.

Numbers xxix., 12–34. The holy convocation of the feast of tabernacles and the feast itself are *fully* described *day by day;* but in Leviticus xxxiii., 34 – 44, only briefly. Numbers prescribes the sacrifices for each day, but says nothing about booths. Leviticus speaks of the booths, but does not specify the sacrifices or special ceremonies. The animals ordered for sacrifice during this greatest of festivals are seventy-one bullocks, fifteen rams, ninety-nine lambs, and seven goats. This number of animals indicates a near approach to more prosperous conditions than they were enjoying.

Numbers xxix., 35–40. We read in this section of the "solemn assembly" on the eighth day of the feast of the tabernacles, which is barely alluded to in Leviticus xxiii., 36. This shows clearly that this great feast, as well as the others, was not only rarely kept, but that they must have been destitute, when kept, of what gave them their hold upon the people in the land of promise. Nor is it probable that when they were settled in the promised land they were able to keep these great festivals, or did keep them, according to the ideal as prescribed in these laws. They all imply an *immediate* possession of their inheritance. And this necessary implication of the laws in themselves accords with the history and authenticates it.

Numbers xxx. It is evident from this chapter that the judges had had serious perplexity in administering the law of vows as recorded in the twenty-seventh chapter of Leviticus; and some general principles to aid the judges are laid down in this chapter. (1) Every man must do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth; but (2) if a woman vowed, there were con-

ditions of fulfilment depending on her father's hearing her; if (3) she was married or betrothed, there were conditions of fulfilment depending upon her husband or betrothed hearing her; if (4) she was a widow or divorced, all shall stand; if (5) she is a wife in her husband's house, the conditions of fulfilment will vary as he did or did not hear her vow.

There is nothing in this chapter to indicate when it was written; but as vows were often, if not always connected with sacrifices, it is very probable that the full treatment of that subject in connection with these great feasts may have opened this question of the obligation of vows, especially when the vow must be paid by the husband or guardian of the person making the vow.

Taking all these *new* laws and *amendments* of old laws into the account, it is quite impossible to escape the conclusion that they were written when the history affirms that they were written, and when the contents of the laws themselves require them to have been written. This origin of these laws, or the most skilful and criminal forgery, is the only possible conclusion of the whole matter.

SECTION III. UNDESIGNED COINCIDENCES.

I wish now to call attention to another class of phenomena denoting the time in which the Pentateuch was composed. I refer to *Undesigned Coincidences*,—correspondences so slight yet so peculiar as to show that an eye-witness recorded the events to which they relate.*

* About thirty years ago, I read a small work by Blunt on this subject. As all my references to that work are lost, I am unable to tell for how many of these coincidences I am indebted to him, and can make only this general acknowledgment.

(1) An instance of this kind is the rate of travelling attributed to the people on their departure from Egypt. In about six or eight days, we find that they had marched as far as Marah, which was two-thirds of the way to Mt. Sinai from Rameses. But they did not reach Sinai under forty-five days. What more natural than that they should travel thus rapidly the first part of the way to escape the enemy, and then slacken their speed to give repose to the feeble and time for the stragglers to come up? Besides, it will be found upon examination that they fled much more rapidly from Rameses till the passage of the Red Sea than they did afterwards. This is entirely natural; and, when we reflect that the writer has only incidentally given us a clew to discover that such was the fact, it forces on us the conviction that he was one of the company.*

(2) The original direction respecting the order of marching was changed for the greater convenience of those who bore the tabernacle and its furniture. It is distinctly stated in the general orders, as recorded in Numbers ii., that after *six* tribes have moved forward,

* The peculiar and apparently unreasonable route which Moses took in leaving Egypt, leading the people into a *cul de sac*,— the sea on the one hand and the mountains on the other, and Pharaoh behind them,— is attributed by the pious historian, writing perhaps half a century afterward, to the special direction of Jehovah to Moses in order probably that He might show forth His power to the fleeing nation, and give them courage to persist in the great undertaking of escaping from bondage and returning to the land of their remote ancestors. This may be so. But I am inclined to another, and to me more probable as it is a more reasonable, explanation of this remarkable mistake of Moses, as it appears to us without the historian's theory or knowledge of its cause. Let the reader bear in mind that God is spoken of by this very pious writer as directing everything and causing everything, and that Moses is scarcely a free agent in anything. Now, I submit as most probable that, when Pharaoh learned that the people had fled, he changed his mind and determined to intercept their march. He accordingly pursued with his horsemen and chariots, and succeeded in outflanking them and

when they decamp, then the Levites shall set forward with the tabernacle. But in the tenth chapter, where we have an account of their setting out on their march, we read that, after *three* tribes had set forward, the tabernacle was taken down, and the sons of Gershon and the sons of Merari set forward bearing the tabernacle. Then came three tribes more, and then the Kohathites set forward bearing the sanctuary, the holy utensils, the altars, and the ark. And a good reason appears why this change was made. The tabernacle would be set up ready to receive the sacred things as soon as those who bore them should arrive upon the ground of re-encampment.

(3) In the *fourth* chapter, we read that a division was made of the different parts of the tabernacle between the sons of Gershon, Merari, and Kohath. The sons of Gershon were to bear the coverings of the tabernacle; the sons of Merari were to bear the pillars and boards and sockets; the sons of Kohath were to bear the sacred vessels, the altars, and the ark. Now, if we turn to the *seventh* chapter, we read of the trains and

getting in their front before they had reached the north-western point of the sea. Moses had his choice either to fight Pharaoh, now in front of him, or flee as well as he could down the country by the side of the sea. He chose the latter alternative, and by removing his marching signal to the rear, and deceiving Pharaoh as to his true position, he gained time, by taking advantage of the darkness and of a very low stage of the water, to get the people over to the other side. When the day dawned, Pharaoh attempted to cross after them, but the muddy bottom and the return of deep water prevented him, and a large number of his army perished in the attempt. Moses turned down by the sea because he was compelled to by the position of the Egyptians; and after their wonderful escape the people saw in it the guidance of their God; and the devout historian of another generation introduces Jehovah as the counsellor and guide of Moses in the whole transaction. Nothing could be more natural. But the reader of to-day must recognize in his study of these early records this pervading language of piety, and interpret them accordingly. I am not satisfied with Brugsch's hypothesis respecting the route of the escaping Israelites.

wagons which were provided some days after to carry the tabernacle. Without giving the reason for the unequal distribution, *two wagons and four oxen* were given to the sons of Gershon, and *four wagons and eight oxen* to the sons of Merari. This difference in capacity for carrying freight corresponds to the difference in the materials which the two parties were to carry, Merari having much the heavier portion, as is found by looking back four chapters, where the distribution of materials is made. It is hardly credible that a later historian would have separated these items in this way, and yet have, thus incidentally, preserved the correspondence between the parts.

(4) The omission of the mention of Simeon in the blessings which Moses pronounced upon the tribes, as recorded in Deuteronomy xxxiii., has given rise to no little speculation. If we turn back to the twenty-fifth chapter of Numbers, a reason will be found for this omission which is entirely satisfactory. We read in the chapter referred to that a terrible plague smote the camp of Israel on account of the introduction of a Midianitish woman into the camp under very offensive circumstances. Twenty thousand died of the plague before it was stayed. This terrible calamity, which happened but a short time before Moses pronounced his blessings on the tribes, was caused by the act of "Zimri, the son of Salu, *a prince of the chief house of the Simeonites*." It appears also that the plague was confined to the tribe of Simeon; for we find in the census, taken but a short time after, that this tribe had diminished thirty-seven thousand. It is not at all wonderful, therefore, that Moses should omit to bless such a tribe, when

their diminished numbers were a standing witness of God's displeasure, and when the plague, which had so devastated their part of the camp, had but just been stayed, and was fresh in the memory of all. Nor is this the conclusion of the matter. We find that, when the tribe took possession of the promised land, Simeon was made a barrier both of Egypt and the Philistines, so that he must first suffer in case of attack from that quarter. These facts, so purely incidental in the manner of their relation, scattered through different chapters, so perfectly accounting for other facts, remarkable in their character yet equally incidentally related, without any reasons given for such strange phenomena, bear with no little weight in the scale of the authenticity and age of these books. That they were not introduced into the Pentateuch for the purpose of supplying the material for this argument to future investigators of the age of the work is evident enough. The supposition is absurd.

(5) The account of the visit of Balaam for the purpose of cursing Israel demands notice. After the ineffectual attempts made by Balak, King of Moab, to induce Balaam to curse Israel, and after Balaam had obtained all the gifts which he was able to wring from the frightened king, we read, Numbers xxiv., 25, that "Balaam rose up and went and returned to his place." "His place," we find in chapter xxii., 5, to be "Pethor," a city of Mesopotamia, on the Euphrates. But we are surprised when we read in chapter xxxi., 8, where the chiefs of Midian are named who had been slain in battle, to find that "Balaam also, the son of Beor," was slain by the sword. How came he here, among the

Midianites? He had left Balak, King of Moab, "to return home." If we turn back to the twenty-second chapter, we find that the "elders of Midian" went with the elders of Moab, with the "rewards of divination in their hand," to invite Balaam to come and "curse Israel." The elders of Midian are no more mentioned in the history; yet in this brief line we find the cause of Balaam's taking Midian in his way, on his return home. More gifts he would obtain, if possible, before he left the country. He was killed while he stopped among that people to finish the object for which he had made his journey from the East. The presence of the historian of these facts on the spot where they transpired seems certain.

(6) In the account of the rebellion and destruction of Korah and his company there are some very striking indications of the writer's presence at the time. The leaders of the rebels, as we learn from Numbers xvi., 1, were "Korah, the son of Izhar, the son of Kohath, the son of Levi; and Dathan and Abiram, the sons of Eliab; and On, the son of Peleth, sons of *Reuben*." How came it to pass that the tribe of *Reuben*, or a part of it, and the Kohathites should be engaged in this rebellion? If we look back *thirteen chapters* to chapter iii., 29, we shall find that in recording the location of the Levites in the camp, the writer states that "the families of the sons of Kohath shall pitch on the side of the tabernacle *southward*." And still *further back*, in chapter ii., 10, we read that "on the *south side* shall be the standard of the camp of Reuben." At the distance of thirteen chapters, and separated from each other by one chapter, we find statements showing that

the tribe of Reuben and the Kohathites were on the same side of the camp, and in close proximity. It would be very easy for them, therefore, to confer together as they are represented as doing.

(7) Again, as we read the account of the punishment inflicted on the rebels, as recorded in the sixteenth chapter, we seem to see the earth open, and Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and "their sons and their wives and their little children," all swallowed up alive. What, then, is our surprise, when we read, *ten chapters later*, in the twenty-sixth chapter, which contains a record of events which transpired *thirty-six years afterwards*, that "the children of Korah died not." We turn back to re-examine the sixteenth chapter, to see if we were mistaken. We there find that the people are commanded to "depart from the tents of those wicked men." "So they gat up from the tabernacle of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, on every side." This tabernacle appears to have been occupied in common by the rebels as their place of meeting with their associates. And then we read that "Dathan and Abiram came out and stood in the door of their tents, and their wives and their sons and their little ones." This public tent of meeting, it seems, stood near the tents of these two men, who were Reubenites, and not near the tent of Korah, who was a Levite; so that when "the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up, and their houses [tents] and all the men [that is, the rebels] that appertained to Korah, and all their goods," the children of Korah, who were in the family tent among the Levites, were not destroyed. Thus the apparent contradiction is reconciled in such a manner as to indicate that an eye-wit-

ness was the historian. I cannot forbear recalling the attention of the reader to another feature of this transaction. Korah, the leader of this rebellion, was son of Izhar, the *second* son of Kohath, Amram, the father of Moses and Aaron, being the first. But the *chief* of the Kohathites was Elzaphan, the son of Uzziel, the *fourth* son of Kohath. It was natural, therefore, that envious feelings should arise, on his part, against the hardship of the younger branch of the family. The posterity of Reuben, the *eldest son* of Jacob, would likewise be not a little dissatisfied that Judah, a younger brother, should be placed at the head of all the tribes.

(8) In the tenth chapter of Leviticus, we read that "Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took either of them his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered *strange fire* before the Lord." For this act, they were smitten dead by fire "from the Lord." And "Mishael and Elzaphan, the sons of Uzziel, the uncle of Aaron," carried their dead bodies "from before the sanctuary out of the camp." No cause for this high-handed act of these two sons of Aaron is given by the writer; but he immediately after records a new law: "Do not *drink wine nor strong drink*, thou [Aaron] nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, *lest ye die*. . . . And that ye may put a difference between holy and unholy, and between clean and unclean." The cause of this new enactment was, most obviously, the sacrilegious act of Aaron's sons, committed when they were intoxicated, and did not put a difference between "holy and unholy, and between clean and unclean." Such gross outrages must not be repeated, and a law is enacted to prevent their recur-

rence. Here we not only have a new law to meet an emergency, but we also have a law based upon the probable condition of those two priests, when the fact of their being intoxicated is not mentioned.

(9) A farther coincidence demands notice in this connection. This act of Nadab and Abihu took place on the eighth day after the tabernacle was erected; for in Exodus xl., 2, we read that the "tabernacle of the tent of the congregation" was to be set up on "the first day of the first month." In the thirteenth verse, we read that Aaron and his sons were to be anointed and clothed in their holy garments for their sacred office. After *seven* chapters in Leviticus, giving directions about particular sacrifices which were to be offered in the tabernacle, we find in the eighth and ninth chapters a specific account of the consecration of Aaron and his sons which continued seven days (chap. viii., 33). On the eighth day (chap. ix., 1), new ceremonies were performed by these priests, their seven days of confinement and seclusion being over; and it is on this eighth day that these sons of Aaron, once more associating with their friends, indulged probably so freely in the use of the cup as to profane the Lord by attempting to serve in their holy office while intoxicated. How natural that men who had been accustomed to the moderate social glass should indulge thus freely after such a week of seclusion! Yet of all this series of causes the writer says not a word; nor is there the remotest ground for the supposition that he had arranged these incidents to furnish us with this argument for the age of his writing. That the narrator was on the spot and related what he saw is too obvious to require comment.

(10) Nor have we yet done with this account. These dead bodies were carried "out of the camp" just *six* days before the passover. Turning forward now *twenty-five* chapters, which are filled with the transactions of these six days, to the ninth chapter of Numbers, we come to the fourteenth day of the first month, on which the passover was to be kept. We here find an account of its observance; and we read "there were *certain men who were defiled by the dead body of a man*, so that they could not keep the passover on that day; and they came before Moses and Aaron," and said that they were defiled and were thus prevented from offering their offering unto the Lord. "Seven days," which were necessary for the purification of those who were unclean by contact with a dead body, had not transpired since Mishael and Elzaphan had carried out their kinsmen's dead bodies, and hence they could not eat of the passover or offer the sacrifice. It is probable that these were the men who came to Moses, as above related; for such a complaint would be likely to originate in the first instance among the chief men, and these men were of that class. The phrase, "the dead body of a man," being the legal term by which ritual uncleanness from contact with the dead is expressed, by no means shows, or implies, that there was but *one* dead body. Three implied conditions are found in this narration, two of them connected with other facts related ten and twenty chapters distant, and *so* related as to show clearly that the writer of these accounts must have been an eye-witness of what he relates, or at least a contemporary of the events, and narrating what he well knew was transpiring. Let

these ten illustrations of "undesigned coincidences" suffice.

SECTION IV. EVIDENCE FROM MINUTENESS OF DETAILS.

Another characteristic of these books, showing their journal-like character, and indicating a writer in the camp of Israel, is found in the *minuteness of the details* in many parts of the narrative, and their repetition under such circumstances as to exculpate any later writer from being the author of such useless definiteness and wearisome repetitions; and yet these same circumstances demanded of the desert-journalist just such a minuteness and repetition. These phenomena have a twofold power: they equally *demand* an ancient, and *forbid* a modern, writer. Let us now examine some of them.

(1) In the census of the people, an account of which is contained in the first chapter of Numbers, there is an illustration of the recording, at the time, of work done, or of the journal-like character of the book. First, we have the names, not only of the superintendents of the census of each tribe, but also the names of their fathers, which it is not probable would have been given by a writer in the time of Ezra. Then we have repeated before the round number of each tribe the formula under which the census was taken, making a repetition of the same words twelve times, which it is difficult to believe an historian a thousand or eight hundred years later would have done; but it is very probable it would be done, when the separate papers of enrolment were passed in and recorded or filed. Seven lines of the nine which constituted the return of each tribe are,

word for word, the same. A later historian of the transaction, with these returns before him, would, at the most, have written the heading but once; and then, after this description of the persons enrolled, he would have named the tribes and their number in order. Of all this, Josephus only says (chap. viii., 2), "The number of the offerers [of the half-shekels, as represented by this census] was six hundred and five thousand five hundred and fifty."

(2) Another illustration of the time and place of writing this Book of Numbers is contained in the second chapter, in which the order of the encampment is specified with great minuteness. The names of the tribes are given, and also the name of the "captain" of the tribe is given, and, yet more, the name of the captain's father, and also the number in the tribe according to the census, and, finally, the whole number in each of the four divisions which were encamped on the four sides of the tabernacle, the account filling thirty-two verses of the chapter. All this would be very necessary in the order for arranging the camp at first; but what historian in the time of Ezra would have given an account of the camp in this manner? Josephus illustrates this admirably (chap. xii., 5): "When they set up the tabernacle, they received it into the midst of their camp, three of the tribes pitching their tents on each side of it." And all that is said by Josephus respecting the elaborate arrangement in the next chapter — abridged in the paragraph below — is that "the priests had the first place about the tabernacle; then the Levites."

(3) Then, in the third chapter, there is a record of the distribution of the material of the tabernacle and

its furniture among the priests and Levites, whose order of encampment is minutely specified inside the other tribes and around the tabernacle, which was their special charge. The sons of Gershon shall have charge "of the covering of the tent and the hanging for the door of the tabernacle of the congregation and the hangings of the court and the curtain for the door of the court . . . and the cords of it." And the charge of Kohath "shall be the ark and the table and the candlestick and the altars and the vessels of the sanctuary and the hanging and all the service thereof." "And the charge of the sons of Merari shall be the boards of the tabernacle, and the bars thereof, and the pillars thereof, and the sockets thereof, and all the vessels thereof, . . . and the pillars of the court round about, and their sockets and their pins and their cords." This has certainly the air of the camp and the desert and the time of the great migration.

(4) But there is yet more of this, and more even, if possible, to the purpose. How shall that portion of the tabernacle furniture which the sons of Kohath are to carry, and which was holy, and which none but a priest could handle on pain of death, be approached, prepared, and borne? In the fourth chapter, from the fourth to the tenth verses, we have a minute description of the manner in which Aaron and his sons "shall cover the ark of testimony with the covering veil, and shall put thereon the covering of badgers' skins, and shall spread over it a cloth wholly of blue, and shall put in the staves thereof," by which it is to be carried. "And upon the table of shew bread they shall spread a cloth of blue and put thereon the dishes, and the spoons, and

the bowls and covers, . . . and they shall spread upon them a cloth of scarlet, and cover the same with a covering of badgers' skins, and shall put in the staves thereof." And the "candlestick, and his lamps, and his tongs, and his snuff dishes, and all the oil vessels thereof," are to be covered with "a cloth of blue," and to be put into "a covering of badgers' skins and put upon a bar"; "and upon the golden altar they shall spread a cloth of blue and cover it with a covering of badgers' skins," "and they shall take all the instruments of ministry . . . and put them in a cloth of blue, and cover them with a covering of badgers' skins, and shall put them on a bar; and they shall take away the ashes from the altar, and spread a purple cloth thereon; and they shall put upon it all the vessels thereof, wherewith they minister about it, even the censers, the fleshhooks and the shovels and the basins, all the vessels of the altar, and they shall spread over it a covering of badgers' skins, and put to the staves of it"; then, and not till then, the sons of Kohath shall come to bear them. Then the service of the sons of Gershon and Merari is to be arranged by Aaron and his sons, and a census of these families is to be taken of all males from thirty to fifty years old, that proper relays and reliefs might be made while marching and in camp.

What I affirm is that all this minute direction and organization of the Levites and priests indicates, *demands* for its justification, its cause, the precise time, and place, and circumstances which the history describes; and that no historian of the nation in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah would have written in this manner. I pass by the fact that the "shittim wood,"

of which the wood-work of the tabernacle and its furniture was made, was abundant about Mount Sinai and rare in Canaan, and that the "badgers' skins" were most probably the skins of a fish which abounded in the Red Sea, as I do not wish to introduce anything as fact into this Study which may be challenged.

(5) But I have not done. I must challenge the reader's patience still further. I cite as a striking proof of the authenticity and age of the Pentateuch the minute account of the offerings made by the princes of Israel to the tabernacle during the period of its dedication. It is contained in the seventh chapter of Numbers, commencing with the twelfth verse. Each prince brought his offering on a day by himself, so that on twelve different days we have the entry made by the scribe in the journal of the offering. Each prince offered the same gifts. The wording of the entry is in each case the same. Leave a blank in either of the entries for the names of the princes, and they will read alike. I will give the first entry: "And he that offered his offering the first day was Nahshon, the son of Amminadab, of the tribe of Judah; and his offering was one silver charger, the weight thereof was a hundred and thirty shekels, one silver bowl of seventy shekels, after the shekel of the sanctuary; both of them were full of fine flour mingled with oil for a meat-offering; one spoon of ten shekels of gold full of incense; one young bullock, one ram, one lamb of the first year, for a burnt-offering; one kid of the goats for a sin-offering; and for a sacrifice of peace-offerings, two oxen, five rams, five he-goats, five lambs of the first year. This was the offering of Nahshon, the son of Amminadab."

Now, instead of simply saying that each of the other princes of the tribes offered in like manner the same offerings unto the Lord, the writer goes on and repeats this inventory eleven times, through eighty verses. It is incredible that a later writer, giving such an account, should proceed in this manner. It appears altogether like an entry made by the scribe to see that the tribes did what was required of them, though no mention of such requisition is made in the record. I have had the curiosity to turn again to Josephus to see how, in his summary of the law, he manages this matter, and will quote the passage which relates to these offerings, that the reader may see the difference between the style of a later writer and that of the old journalists. Josephus says: "Every head of a tribe brought a bowl, a charger, and a spoon of ten daricks full of incense. Now the charger and bowl were of silver, and together they weighed two hundred shekels, but the bowl cost no more than seventy shekels; and these were full of fine flour mingled with oil, such as they used on the altar about the sacrifices. They brought also a young bullock and a ram, with a lamb a year old, for a whole burnt-offering; as also a goat, for the forgiveness of sins. Every one of the heads of the tribes brought also other sacrifices, called peace-offerings; for every day, two bulls and five rams, with lambs of a year old and kids of the goats. These heads of the tribes were twelve days in sacrificing, one sacrificing every day." The contrast between these two accounts clearly shows us how an historian living long after the events, as in the time of Ezra, would have managed such a subject.

(6) Another illustration of this head of my argument is found in the wearisomely minute diagnostics of the leprosy in men, houses, and garments (Leviticus xiii., xiv.). Two long chapters, of nearly sixty verses each, are filled with the repulsive details of the indications and purification of this most loathsome of all diseases. I must be excused from quoting any of it. No more modern historian would thus burden his pages; but then and there it was necessary, for definite rules must be given for the guidance of the priests. Indeed, the whole of this portion of the Pentateuch which refers to ritual impurities indicates clearly enough that it had its birth in the camp, among a people just emerging from barbarism.

(7) Perhaps the most marked of all these laboriously minute descriptions and repetitions is to be found in the last half of Exodus, where the tabernacle and its furniture and the priests' garments are described in the most accurate manner, even to the tassels and pins and taches (Exodus xxv.–xxx.). Moses brings this minute description of the whole sacerdotal dress and tabernacle construction and incense manufacture with him from the Mount. It is precisely like the specifications in a modern contract for building a dwelling-house or making a garment or a confection, but more minute, if possible. The work is given out by Moses; and, as the workmen bring back to him the portion which they undertook to make, it is entered again with the same minute description in the Pentateuch (Exodus xxxvi.–xxxix.). So that we have a duplicate description of all these articles, so wearisomely minute that we

can hardly have patience to read it once. Admit that this was written on the spot, and all this minuteness and duplication is accounted for: deny this, and there is no possible reason why such a minute detail of these articles should be repeated, even if we can discover why they should be once described. It seems incredible that any later writer could have done it. Of the "pattern given in the Mount," which is so minutely described, before the work was done, in the Pentateuch, Josephus only says (chap. v., 8), "He [God] had suggested to him [Moses] that he would have a tabernacle built for him, and that the tabernacle should be of such measure and construction as he had showed him." Josephus then gives a careful description of the work. There is no repetition of particulars.

To feel the full force of this argument, it is necessary that one should read carefully the account in the Pentateuch, and at one sitting, if possible.

I should be glad to go into a consideration of the specific directions given touching many of the conditions of camp life, and especially those health regulations which it was necessary for a people thus sojourning to observe, and which no modern historian could dwell upon so long and minutely as they are dwelt upon in the Pentateuch; but the nature of the subjects, as well as the great length of my Study, requires that I should pass them over. Their bearing upon the point which I am considering is clear and strong; and, in connection with some of the circumstances which I have already referred to, they furnish evidence, almost conclusive in itself, of the antiquity of the work in which they are contained.

SECTION V. EVIDENCE FROM CHASMS IN THE HISTORY.

The *chasms* in the history are another indication of the antiquity of the Pentateuch. (1) The space of nearly four hundred years, according to the reckoning which commends itself to many scholars, from the descent of Jacob and his family into Egypt to the departure of the people, is passed over in almost entire silence; and so also are the youth and manhood of Moses, in which Josephus and the rabbins revel and glory. Only those incidents are mentioned which are necessary to an introduction to the great work of deliverance from Egyptian bondage. We can hardly suppose that a writer of the time of Ezra would have left such gaps in his history. The particular and wonderful events in the life of Moses before his flight to Midian, which tradition had handed down, and which attracted the Jews in the time of Josephus, could hardly have escaped the notice of earlier writers. They would have filled up these chasms with such traditions as had come down to them respecting the marvellous life of their great law-giver. That such would have been their course can hardly be doubted by any one who is acquainted with Jewish writers, and knows how prone they were to introduce traditionary tales where historical facts failed them.

Nor is the chasm referred to, all. Thirty-seven years, covering a large portion of the period of the wandering in the wilderness, is left an entire blank, and we know almost nothing of what transpired, except the stations which from time to time the people occupied. A more attractive field for the growth of traditions could not be imagined; and not to enter it would

require more regard for historical truth, or a nicer discrimination between what is true and what is false, than later writers of that nation have shown in their works, or than some modern critics give them credit for. I cannot introduce illustrations to show the correctness of these remarks. Those readers who are familiar with Jewish literature do not need them, and those who are not will find enough of them in the writings of Philo, Josephus, the Talmudists, and the rest. Admit that the principal parts of the last four books of the Pentateuch are the work of a writer, a scribe or scribes, contemporary with the events which are recorded in them, and these chasms are easily accounted for: assume any later period for their composition, and they present insurmountable obstacles.

SECTION VI. EVIDENCE FROM EGYPTIAN CUSTOMS.

I should be glad to go at length into a consideration of the minute and circumstantial references which we find in the Pentateuch to Egyptian customs. But I must confine myself to one, as an illustration of many, which impresses deeply upon the mind the opinion that an eye-witness must have recorded them. A resident in Egypt, and none other, could thus have colored the history with such delicate touches denoting his age and residence. In the fifth chapter of Exodus, the historian gives an account of the additional labor which was put upon the Hebrews when they complained of their tasks, and asked leave to go into the country for three days to worship. "I will not give you straw," said Pharaoh. "Go ye, get you straw where ye can find it. . . . So the people were scattered abroad throughout all

the land of Egypt to gather *stubble* instead of *straw*." The "straw" was that which had been broken upon the threshing-floor ; the "stubble" was what had been left standing in the field after reaping. If we turn now to Wilkinson's *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians* (Vol. VI., page 86), we shall find an engraving, taken from the ancient tombs, in which is represented the gathering of wheat. The reapers are represented as cutting off only the heads of the grain, which they put in baskets, and leaving the "stubble" nearly as high as their shoulders behind them. This was the "stubble" which the Hebrews went out to gather, not the short stubble which was left when the straw was cut near the ground. The overtasked Hebrews had not the privilege of going to the threshing-floors and getting their "straw": they were compelled to gather this high "stubble" in the field. In the same work, we find illustrations of brick-making, and bricks made with straw are found in the ruins of the ancient cities.

Such minute knowledge of the manners of Egypt as the writer of the Pentateuch everywhere shows, and which it would cover pages to describe, confirms the opinion of its Mosaic origin. It is hardly conceivable that a later writer could have so fully informed himself of ancient customs as to have spoken of them so incidentally and yet so accurately and minutely.

SECTION VII. EVIDENCE FROM EGYPTIAN WORDS AND RITES.

Another evidence of the early origin of the Pentateuch is found in the use of Egyptian words, the adop-

tion of Egyptian customs in their worship, both in utensils, altars, and robes, and also in the establishment of a priesthood and ritual. In the first sixteen chapters of Exodus, in which the bondage and escape of the people are described, no less than forty-eight words, exclusive of proper names, of Egyptian origin, are used, if such scholars as Gesenius and Bunsen can be relied upon, to say nothing of Seyffarth and Harkavy and Wilkinson. Egypt must have been the native land of the author. He is familiar with the manners and customs of the people. The whole account is evidence of such an author. The Urim and Thummim were Egyptian symbols of Truth and Justice, and were worn by the judge or priest in the breastplate which was over his priestly dress, as is shown in Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*. The dress of the priests is not unlike that of the Egyptian priests — linen — as represented in the same work. Their bathing and shaving the whole body were the same also. Even the ark of the covenant and the cherubim over it are copied from those used in Egypt, as may be seen in Wilkinson, Vol. V., page 276. As far as modern studies in Egyptian archæology have gone, they confirm the accuracy of the description of the manners, laws, and language of that ancient people made by the writer of the Pentateuch, and remand its composition to an early age and a native of the country.

It has been objected to the antiquity and unity of the Pentateuch that such a complicated ritual and comprehensive body of laws could not have sprung into existence at once; that generations, centuries, were necessary to evolve and mature them. It is forgotten

by those who present this objection that the Egyptians were an old nation when Jacob's family went among them. They had the most attractive and elaborate ritual the world knew,— priests, temples, altars, sacrifices, were almost everywhere. Their laws were the mature wisdom of ages. How easy was it, comparatively speaking, for the law-giver of Israel to arrange, with the aid of such a ritual and such laws, the ritual and laws which we find in the Pentateuch, so similar to those of Egypt as to reveal their relationship, and so dissimilar as to prevent confounding them, and establishing the independence of their author! No careful student of the Hebrew code and ritual can fail to see the influence of an Egyptian education and residence upon the law-giver; so that the objection is itself transformed into an argument in favor of the antiquity of the Pentateuch and even of its Mosaic origin. He would naturally, trained as he had been, construct a full code and ritual for the recently delivered people. Nor is it any valid evidence, scarcely a presumption, that he did not do it, because they were but imperfectly administered, and in some respects apparently persistently violated for centuries. The code and the ritual sprang fully formed, mature, from the brain of Moses, like Minerva from the brain of Jupiter. The people were not able to understand or appreciate but a small part of them at first, and some portions of them were very probably found impracticable or so burdensome as to compel neglect. The code and the ritual were ideal, and could not in every particular be made real. The servile, emancipated race developed slowly up to the standard of their law whose requirements were ever

before them. Their barbarism gradually wore off, and the knowledge of the one only God increased, and diminished their belief in other gods and their relish of idolatrous rites. The people *grew up* to the law, as Christians are growing up to Christianity. The gospel reads to-day as it did eighteen centuries ago, but how differently it is understood and practised! The Mosaic code and ritual read the same through all the tumultuous period of the Judges and the revolution under Samuel, and during the monarchy; but how differently were they regarded as the people sloughed off their barbarisms and improved in knowledge!

SECTION VIII. NO EVIDENCE OF ENACTMENTS AFTER THE TIME OF MOSES.

One point further, and I will close. The Pentateuch concludes its history with the death of Moses, and professes to contain only those laws and rites which were prescribed by him. *There is not a particle of reliable evidence, either external or internal, that a single law recorded in the Pentateuch was the work of the period subsequent to the time of Moses.* I affirm this with the emphasis of assurance. The possession of the promised land is always spoken of as future. New laws are given, new regulations are established on the banks of the Jordan, just before the people passed over to take possession of their country, such as their changed condition would require. No laws were made afterwards of which we have any record which were fundamental. All appeals are made to the law of Moses.

So much for the *antiquity* of the Pentateuch. Who was its writer? To answer this question is no purpose

of this Study. Probably Moses was the principal author. I am aware that one objection which has weight in some minds is made to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch: it is that he is spoken of in the third person in the historical portions. This is true; and admitting that it has weight so far as the Mosaic authorship is concerned, it has no weight whatever against my position; for I am not proving that Moses was the writer of the Pentateuch, but that it was chiefly at least composed during his life. Against this position, the objection has no force whatever. But I am by no means willing to give it the weight which is claimed for it as conclusive against the Mosaic authorship under any circumstances. Xenophon is admitted on all hands to have written the *Anabasis*, and yet he never speaks of himself in the first person, though he is the principal character in the work. Who can dogmatically assert that Moses did not do the same thing? Besides, who can say that Moses did not adopt the usual practice of early times, as indicated both in history and in monuments, of employing a scribe, or scribes, who took note of passing events, as well as writing out the laws, who would naturally speak of Moses in the third person?

The whole book has the style and coloring, the contents and structure, of a writing of the Mosaic age. A few passages of later date can easily be accounted for as *scholia* — explanatory clauses — which have been introduced into the text by later copyists and readers. Some apparent or real contradictions can be easily disposed of by the same method, or as failures in the memory of the original writer. As well might one challenge the antiquity of the pyramid because he had

found a modern stone imbedded in one of its courses. Whether its condition could be accounted for or not, no antiquarian would think of pronouncing the monument of Cheops a work of the Ptolemies, standing in its hoary presence, with the voice of history sounding in his ears. As no astronomer would be accounted sane who should dispute that the sun is the source of light because a few dark spots are found on its surface, so no scholar who has surveyed all sides of this subject in the full light of modern discoveries can reasonably deny to the Mosaic age the production of the Pentateuch on account of alleged modern interpolations, imperfect genealogies, or contradictory dates and names which are found in it.

SECTION IX. RESULTS.

It results from the foregoing investigation : —

I. That that portion of the Hebrew Scriptures called the Pentateuch, or the Five Books of Moses, can be traced by a common name — "The Book of the Law," "The Law given by Moses," "The Law," and other titles — from the time of Christ back through all the extant literature of the nation — prose and poetry, prophecy and proverb, history and psalm — till the time of David, and in all fragments of its literature of an earlier date ; —

II. That all the passages quoted from the book with these titles are found in the Pentateuch, and often its peculiar phraseology is preserved in the quotation, showing that the book is proved to be the same by its contents as well as by its title ; —

III. That there is not the slightest hint in the historical books that these laws were enacted or revised

in any later time than that of the Mosaic age; all Jewish opinions to this effect being of a much later date, and based upon no historical evidence whatever;—

IV. That the language of the Pentateuch, its peculiar phrases and "archaic words," shows that it must have been written some centuries before any other of the extant Hebrew writings, thus remitting its composition to several generations before the time of David, as the language of the earliest Psalms, which are free from them, witnesses;—

V. That the contents of the Pentateuch, the journal-like arrangement of its events and laws, the constant assumption or implication that it was written in a camp, and many of its laws adapted only to camp life, the amendments of laws when on the borders of the promised land to fit them to the changed condition and wants of the people, the inventories of gifts, and the record of specifications for wood-work, and curtains, and garments, and vessels for sacred use, the record of incidents which caused new laws to be enacted or old laws to be amended, the incidental and most obviously undesigned coincidences of events which are separated by many chapters and much time, confirm the previous historic and linguistic evidence of the early origin of the Pentateuch, and place its composition in the Mosaic age, and prove its direct or indirect Mosaic authorship;—

VI. That the tumultuous anarchical times before the accession of David to the throne render it very probable that sections of the law may have been misplaced, possibly lost; that some of the historical sections may have been disarranged; and that as time passed on

old names were modernized, obscure incidents explained, and modern words and phrases sometimes substituted for the obsolete originals; but none of these modern explanations and interpolations and supposed corrections in the least degree affecting the force of the argument derived from the above-mentioned considerations of the age and at least the principal authorship of the work;—

VII. That, notwithstanding the difficulties attending the reference of this work to so early an age and authorship, they vanish into comparative unimportance when compared with those which attend any other theory of its composition, especially that which refers it to the time of Ezra, or accounts for it by miscellaneous aggregations made during the ten centuries which transpired between Moses and Nehemiah;—

VIII. And, finally, that the only reasonable, and indeed the necessary, inference to be drawn from these facts—the historical references to this book by the same names to the earliest times; the quotations made from it in later writings corresponding in minute particulars to passages found in it; the archaisms with which it abounds; the journal and camp-like arrangement and tone of its laws; the undesigned coincidences, indicating a writer on the spot; the occasional explanation of antique words, names, and customs; and the insuperable difficulties of fixing upon any other period for its composition—is that the Pentateuch belongs to the Mosaic age, and fixes the authorship of the book upon Moses and his contemporaries or immediate successors.

CONCLUSION.

DIFFICULTIES OF ANY THEORY OF UNBELIEF.

I KNOW the objections raised, the suspicion surmised, the prejudices appealed to; but I also know that there are difficulties in unbelief as well as in belief. It is often supposed that there are no difficulties trailing after denial; that some belief is not professed or implied when another is rejected. But he who denies the antiquity of the Pentateuch will be required by that denial to believe some things which will stagger reason and forbid faith. That very denial will compel him to adopt a positive opinion respecting the origin of the Pentateuch, which will draw after it difficulties more insolvable and facts more incredible than the plagues of Egypt or the refluent waves of the Red Sea. For he must believe that an unbroken chain of writers from the days of Josephus to the time of David, including philosophers, historians, poets, prophets, have quoted different books under the same title, and containing the same laws, expressed in the same words; that, between the translation of the Septuagint, in the golden reign of Philadelphus, and the time of the prophet Malachi, about a century, this "Book of the Law of Moses" was mostly written and palmed off upon the Jewish scribes as of Mosaic origin, and gravely translated by them into Greek at his command; or that, between the time of Malachi and the time of Ezra, about

half a century more, some one or more of the returned exiles constructed a work which received the approbation of both prophets and rulers, people and priests, as the "Book of Moses" by whose laws their fathers had been guided; or that Ezra himself codified and published the national laws under the title of the "Laws of Moses," or invented nearly all of them, and succeeded in making the people receive them as such, either by gross fraud or because they were really of Mosaic origin, and yet his history makes *no mention* of such a wonderful work in narrating the invaluable services rendered to the people by this efficient ruler; or that, a century before, Hilkiah and Shaphan imposed a code under the name of "The Book of the Law of the Lord by Moses" upon King Josiah and all the nation, and that Hezekiah had no such "Book of the Law of Moses" as the historian affirms, and that Amaziah did not quote from it when he said, as it "is written in the Book of the Law of Moses," and that Jehoshaphat did not send out the scribes to teach that book when they "took the Book of the Law of the Lord with them," and that Jehoash had some other book under the name of "the Law" given him when he was anointed king, and that David did not refer to it when he charged Solomon to have regard to what "is written in the Law of Moses." He must believe, moreover, that different books and different codifications of the laws of the people from time to time are thus referred to, when not one lisp in the whole history or poetry or prophecy of the nation can be found to that effect. He must believe that the nation was so stupid as to permit it, and its historians so careless as not to mention

it either to the honor or the disgrace of any scribe or king. He must believe that in the time of Ezra or Josiah a writer succeeded in imitating the ancient style of the Mosaic age so perfectly that all the scribes and priests were deceived into the belief that it was the work of Moses, even when there was no evidence that he ever wrote such a book, or that such a book had ever existed in the nation. Nay, more: he must believe that all its complicated and burdensome laws were received at once and adopted as the code of the nation, *because* they believed them to be of Mosaic origin, and submitted to the severe discipline which these laws imposed, without once questioning the authenticity of the book or the authority of the law-giver. He must believe that the writer not only invented the accounts of the building of the tabernacle, and wearisomely repeated them, and also introduced the repetitious descriptions of the offerings and the consecration of the sacred things, but he must believe that he could luckily hit upon or skilfully invent those numerous *undesigned coincidences* which are scattered all through the book, so evidently unobserved by the writer himself. He must believe that the writer — guilty of one of the grossest impositions ever practised upon a people — was never suspected, much less accused, of fraud, but that his spurious work was received and adopted without a word of complaint, suspicion, or hesitation by a whole nation. He must believe that no "Book of the Law" was in existence during the reign of David, and that all the historians, prophets, and poets which have referred to it in an unbroken series from his time down to the time of Nehemiah and Malachi, Sirach and Philo, were mis-

taken, or else he must believe that a gross corruption of the old copy was made, and made in so skilful a manner that no one detected it then, or can now tell with any certainty the new portions which were added to the old book. The learned men of Jehoshaphat, the scholarly priest and scribe of Josiah, the noble Ezra, the skilful Nehemiah, never suspected the fraud, never discovered the cheat. Nor did the prophets Joel and Hosea, Isaiah and Jeremiah, Haggai and Malachi, have a suspicion that "the Law," "the Laws of Moses," "the Law of the Lord," on which they based all their predictions, and to which they appealed in confirmation of all their threatenings and promises, was a mere collection made from age to age of the laws of the nation, and attributed, by a pious fraud or illiterate mistake, to their great deliverer, Moses, to give them sanctity and power over the people. Surely, a louder curse would have leaped from the fiery lips of Isaiah upon the head of such a deceiver than he ever uttered against the hypocritical priests who "trampled the courts of the Lord." Yet such must be his belief who disbelieves.

Adopting the canon of Hume, that of two miracles we should believe that which is the less marvellous and incredible, I accept the miracle, if it be one, of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, rather than the theory which makes it either the growth of centuries or the work of a modern Jew of the time of Ezra. The difficulties attending the last theory are vastly greater than those which surround the first. As easily could I believe that the basaltic pillars which compose the Giant's Causeway were the work of the fabulous

race whose name they bear, and not the production of the earth's central fires. I believe, then, that the Pentateuch is a work of the Mosaic age, and largely the work of Moses himself; that it has come down to us with few, very few, dislocations, interpolations, and corruptions; and that it will be handed down to coming ages as an admired monument of the wisdom, learning, and arts of that remote age,— as a monument of an early revelation of the divine will, to restore and elevate the race. I believe that the more thorough the investigations are which are directed to the examination of this book, the more profound and searching the scholarship which is devoted to the inquiry of its age and authorship, the more successful the endeavors of the explorers of the ancient monuments on the Nile and the Tigris in exhuming sculptured tablets and opening tombs whose walls are pictured history, the more brilliant the success of the Rawlinsons, the Layards, and the Hinckses, the Smiths and the Sayces, in deciphering the cuneiform inscriptions on the walls of the palaces of the successors of Ninus, and of the Wilkinsons and the Lepsiuses and the Mariettes in interpreting the painted symbols and hieroglyphic histories in the tombs of the Pharaohs contemporary with Abraham and Joseph and Moses, the more certainty will be given to the conclusions which I have reached, or, at least, to which I have pointed the way: that THE PENTATEUCH IS SUBSTANTIALLY OF THE MOSAIC AGE, AND LARGELY, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, OF MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP.

NOTE A.

Several eminent critics on the Continent and in England, and a few in this country, hold that the Pentateuch, with the exception of a few brief passages, was not written till a period long subsequent to the time of Moses. The Book of Deuteronomy was composed, some say forged, in the time of King Josiah, by Hilkiah and his associates, and is the book which they pretended to have "found" while the Temple was undergoing repairs. They also maintain that the ritual law, or Priest-Code, as they call it, was not written till the return from the exile, and that the Book of Genesis was a compilation made by an author as late probably as the last years of the kingdom of Judah. Some critics also claim that the code of ritual laws, though not written out, was growing up during the reign of the later kings, and that its fragmentary character is proof of it. Indeed, they maintain that Exodus–Numbers is a mosaic of fragments of laws selected from larger codes, and that these fragments can be separated. They have attempted to make this separation. But no two of them agree as to the fragments used, which shows that the fragmentary theory, as regards Exodus–Numbers, is by no means established, or capable of being established. To show the reader how the most eminent of these theoretical critics differ in their selection of these fragments, I will give their dissection of Exodus xii. I select six of them,— Stähelin, Knobel, Kayser, Nöldeck, Dillman, and Wellhausen.

Stähelin selects as Elohistic verses 1–28, 43–51.

Knobel selects as Elohistic verses 1–23, 28, half of 37, 40–51; that is, Knobel omits four verses which Stähelin calls Elohistic, and adds four in different places to Stähelin's number.

Kayser selects as Elohistic verses 1–10, 14–20, 28, 40–51, omitting thirteen verses that Stähelin accepts, and eleven verses that Knobel accepts. No two of the three agree in their choice of fragments. Again: —

Nöldeck selects as Elohistic verses 1–23 (24–27 doubtful), 28,

half of 37, 40–51. He differs from each of the other three in his selections, and attributes to some editor half of 37 and all of 38.

Dillman selects as Elohistic verses 1–20, 28, half of 37, 40, 41, 43–50, differing more or less from all the others, and attributing to another Elohistic writer verses 21 (?), 31–33, the other half of 37, 38, 42. Let the reader examine these divisions, and satisfy himself of their utter groundlessness. But I have not done.

Wellhausen selects as Elohistic verses 1–20, 28, half of 37, 40, 41, 43–50. He and Dillman agree in these selections; but we shall see, as we proceed, that they differ in making other selections.

I will only delay to say that these eminent critics, whose discoveries we are called upon to accept, *do not agree.*

But there are the *Jehovistic* selections of these critics yet to be examined.

Stähelin selects as Jehovistic verses 29–36, leaving six verses of the chapter unaccounted for or attributed to the compiler. This is seen by adding together his Elohistic and Jehovistic passages.

Knobel selects as Jehovistic verses 24–27, 29–36, half of 37, and 38, 39, differing widely from Stähelin.

Kayser selects as Jehovistic verses 11–13, 21–27, 29–39, differing from both the former.

Nöldeck selects as Jehovistic verses 29–36, 39, and attributing to the compiler half of 37, and 38, not accounting at all for eleven verses, and differing from all the other critics.

Dillman selects as Jehovistic verses 21(?)–27, 29, 30, 34–36, 39, and not agreeing with any of the above named.

Wellhausen selects as Jehovistic verses (21–27 doubtful), 29–39, 42, not agreeing in this selection, as in the other, with Dillman, and with none of the others.

Wellhausen, the most eminent among those who have attempted to show that the Pentateuch is made up of fragments, has a peculiar theory, which I will state. The reader can omit it if he is tired of this folly of learned men.

The Jehovistic document, as we now have it, or fragments of it, in the Pentateuch, is composed of an original Jehovistic document, and a first, second, and third emendation of it, so that, in

fact, it had been changed by additions and subtractions three times, and consisted of four parts; namely, the original and the three changes made by the three revisers.

The Elohistic document underwent the same changes as the Jehovistic, and consisted of the original document and three revisions.

In this condition these documents would seem to be in a sufficiently mixed state to defy separation. But be patient, reader, if indeed you have ventured to read. Wellhausen is not satisfied with this mixture, but says that the three-times revised Jehovistic document is promiscuously added to the three-times revised Elohistic document; and these eight, or by another reckoning twenty, intermixed documents he claims to have detected and separated even to clauses of only a dozen words!

No two of these critics whom we are called upon to confide in and follow agree in more than one instance; and several passages in the chapter are not put into either the Jehovistic or Elohistic class, but are attributed to the compiler or editor of the Pentateuch. When we demand that at least two of these critics shall agree in their separation into fragments of the books before we are accused of stupidity or bigotry for not blindly following them, our demand is reasonable, and we should stand by it. Wellhausen goes so far as to say "there were at least *twenty-two* authors, editors, and emendators engaged in the composition and completion of the Pentateuch." Till some better agreement is reached than we find in these critics, and from whose opinion nine-tenths, if not nineteen-twentieths, of the Hebrew scholars in England and America decidedly assent, it will be as reasonable as it is prudent to accept the conclusion that the Pentateuch is a work of the Mosaic age, and much of it the work of the hand of Moses.

*** Readers desiring further information concerning the current critical schools of thought are referred to a series of papers by H. L. Hastings, included in the ANTI-INFIDEL LIBRARY under the following titles: "*The Higher Criticism*"; "*Jesus of Nazareth as a Higher Critic*"; "*The Pentateuch: Its Origin and Authority*"; "*Specimen Bricks from the Babel of the Higher Critics*"; "*More Specimen Bricks from the Babel of the Higher Critics*," *etc.* To be obtained of the publisher of this volume.

ANALYTICAL INDEX.

PAGE

INTRODUCTORY ON KUENEN'S "RELIGION OF ISRAEL."

Style of the Work, and Test of the Truth of Later Writers, ... 7–10
Illustrations of Perversions of History by Priests and Prophets, ... 11–13
Theory of Human Progress the Test of All History, . 14–16
Point of Departure in the Inquiry of the Historic Truth, and Dr. Kuenen's Method of Argument, . 16–24
Reform under Hezekiah and Josiah, ... 24–27
Hilkiah's "Book of the Law," 27–32
The Law the Work of Ezekiel and Ezra (Leviticus xviii., xxvi.), ... 33–36
Objection that "No Mention is made of any such Work as the Pentateuch in any Work written before the Captivity" examined, ... 37–58
Testimony of the Book of the Kings, ... 37–39
" " " " Chronicles, ... 39–42
" " " " Joshua, Judges, Samuel, 42–47
" " " " Ezra, Nehemiah, . . 47–57
Conclusion 57
Appendix A: "The Bible for Learners." Some of its Theories noticed,— Sinai, Samson, Korah, . . 59–65
Appendix B: Some of Dr. Kuenen's Theories examined,— Priests, Levites, etc., ... 66–69
No Prophetic Writing till Eighth Century, . 70
Not One Psalm from David, ... 70
Different Documents in Exodus and Numbers, ... 71

A STUDY OF THE PENTATEUCH.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION, ... 75–81
EXTERNAL EVIDENCES, ... 82
I. *Christ to Malachi.*
1st Esdras, ... 83
1st Maccabees, ... 84
Ecclesiasticus, ... 84
Septuagint Version, ... 84
Samaritan Pentateuch, ... 84
II. *Malachi to Captivity.*
Malachi, ... 85
Haggai, ... 85
Zechariah, ... 85
Nehemiah, ... 85–86
Ezra, ... 86–87
III. *Captivity to David.*
(1) Historical Books, remarks on, . . . 87–90
Books of the Kings, ... 90–100
Josiah, ... 90–93
Hezekiah, ... 93–94
Amaziah, ... 94
Jehoash, ... 94
David, ... 95
Solomon, ... 95–100
Books of Chronicles, ... 100–104
(2) Poetical Books, ... 104–132
1. The Prophets.
Daniel, ... 105
Habbakuk, ... 105
Zephaniah, ... 105
Ezekiel, ... 105–107
Jeremiah, ... 107–112
Isaiah, ... 112–115
Micah, ... 115
Hosea, ... 115–121
Amos, ... 121–126
Joel, ... 126–127

PAGE

2. Poems.
Ecclesiastes, ... 127
Solomon's Song, ... 127
Proverbs, ... 128
Psalms, ... 128–132
Value of this Evidence, ... 132–134
IV. *David to Moses*, ... 134–156
1st Samuel, ... 134–141
Judges, ... 141–142
Joshua, ... 142–146
Observations on External Evidence, ... 146–151
Conclusion, ... 152–156

INTERNAL EVIDENCE.
General Observations as to what would be the Character of the Books, supposing them to have been written at the Time claimed, 157–159
I. Antiquity of Style, ... 159–176
II. Contents and Structure. Removal of Unexpected Difficulties in the Laws, and Comparison of Numb. Lev. and Deut., ... 177–198
III. Undesigned Coincidences, ... 198–208
IV. Minuteness of Details, ... 208–215
V. Chasms in the History, ... 216–217
VI. References to Egyptian Customs, . . . 217–218
VII. Adoption of Egyptian Words and Rites, 218–221
VIII. No Evidences of Later Enactments, . . 221–223
IX. Results, ... 223–225
X. Conclusion.— Difficulties of Unbelief, . 226–230

THE WONDERFUL LAW.

THE

WONDERFUL LAW.

By H. L. HASTINGS,
Editor of "THE CHRISTIAN" *Boston, Mass.*

"Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy Law."
Psalm cxix. 18.

SCRIPTURAL TRACT REPOSITORY:

H. L. HASTINGS,
BOSTON, U. S. A.: No. 47 CORNHILL.
Copyright, 1888.
MARSHALL BROS, AGENTS,
LONDON: No. 10 PATERNOSTER ROW.
Entered at Stationers' Hall.

PRINTED IN AMERICA.

THE WONDERFUL LAW.

BY H. L. HASTINGS.

As the sojourner in Rome passes along the *Via Sacra*, among the various memorials of Rome's departed splendor he will observe a massive arch, which has been standing for centuries, and which recalls the palmiest days of the Iron Empire; those days when the plundered spoils and treasures of conquered nations were gathered to adorn and enrich the Roman Capital.

Upon the inside of this arch, some fifteen or twenty feet above the base, are to be seen carved in stone a number of life-size human figures, bearing various articles; a table, a curious candlestick with seven branches, a censer for incense, two trumpets, and other trophies of the victorious prowess of Roman arms.

That arch is known as the Arch of Titus, and was erected to commemorate the triumphal celebration granted by the city of Rome in honor of the illustrious exploits which had been performed by Titus and his father Vespasian. Each of them had won great honors by their victories, and the Roman senate had decreed to each a public Triumph; but when Titus had returned from his journey to Egypt, and met his father Vespasian and his brother Domitian, it was determined to have but one Triumph for both father and son; and or

the day appointed for this pompous procession all Rome poured out to witness the magnificent spectacle.

When the appointed morning dawned, Vespasian and Titus came out from the temple of Isis where they had lodged the previous night, crowned with laurel, and clothed in those purple robes which were proper to their family, and went as far as the Octavian Walk, where the senate and principal rulers waited for them; and where, being seated in ivory chairs on a tribunal or platform, they were hailed by the acclamations of the soldiers who were gathered to do them honor. After solemn devotions Vespasian briefly addressed the people. Then the soldiers were sent away to a feast, while Vespasian and Titus returned to the *Gate of the Pomp*, through which such processions marched, put on their triumphal garments, and offered sacrifices to the gods of ancient Rome.

The triumphal procession then moved forward into the city. In it were borne vast quantities of silver, gold, and ivory, wrought in curious forms; purple hangings, precious stones, crowns of gold, gems of the utmost magnificence, imposing idols made of costly materials, and animals of every species; the whole being attended by multitudes of men robed in purple interwoven with gold. Captives from many lands marched in the procession, in which were also borne pageants, three or four stories high, covered with carpets of gold and ornamented with ivory, on which were portrayed happy countries laid waste, squadrons of enemies slain, fugitives fleeing from their invaders, captives led away, cities overthrown and desolated, fortifications taken, strongholds stormed by armies which poured within their walls,—with pictures of burning temples, demolished houses falling upon their owners, rivers flowing through lands wasted by fire and sword, and various other representations of war, defeat, and victory.

Following these were a multitude of ships laden with

the spoils gathered in abundance from conquered cities and nations. "But," says the historian, "for those that were taken in the temple of Jerusalem, *they* made the greatest figure of all; that is, the golden table, of the weight of many talents, the candlestick also that was made of gold, though its construction was now changed, and the small branches were now produced out of it to a great length, having likeness to a trident in their position, and had every one a socket made of brass for a lamp at the tops of them. These lamps were in number seven, and represented the dignity of the number *seven* among the Jews; and the LAST OF ALL THE SPOILS, were carried THE LAWS OF THE JEWS. After these spoils, passed by a great many men carrying the images of Victory, whose structure was entirely either of ivory or of gold; after which Vespasian marched in the first place, and Titus followed him; Domitian also rode along with them and made a glorious appearance, and rode on a horse that was worthy of admiration."*

This great procession marched on until the rear of it reached the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, where they halted as was their custom, until word was brought that the general of the enemy was slain. This general was Simon, son of Gioras, who had been led in this show with the captives—seven hundred of whom, eminently tall and handsome, Titus had ordered carried to Rome to grace his triumph. A rope had been cast over Simon's head, and he had been dragged with abuse and insult into the forum, and there slain. When the news of his death was brought back to the procession the people shouted for joy, offered up sacrifices, and then dispersed to finish the day with mirth and festivity.

"After these triumphs were over, and the affairs of the Romans were settled on a sure foundation, Vespasian

*Josephus, *Wars of the Jews*, b. vii. chap. v. §§ 3–6.

resolved to build a temple to Peace. . . He had this temple adorned with pictures and statues. . . . He also laid up therein those golden vessels and instruments that were taken out of the Jewish temple as ensigns of his glory. But still he gave order that they should LAY UP THEIR LAW and the purple veils of the Holy Place, IN THE ROYAL PALACE and keep them there."*

This was the Triumph, as described by an eye-witness, which commemorated the downfall of Jerusalem, the overthrow of the commonwealth of Israel, the captivity of the Jews, and their dispersion into all lands. And that Arch of Titus stands to-day, on the *Via Sacra*, with its representations of the golden candlestick, table, trumpets, and censer, and is a perpetual memorial of the victory of imperial Rome, the downfall of the Jewish government, and the scattering of that nation among all the inhabitants of the earth.

From that day to this, for more than eighteen centuries, the Jewish nation have been wanderers on the face of the earth, strangers and pilgrims, exiles from their own land, without a government, without a city, without a temple, without a home, struggling, suffering and enduring; and to-day is still fulfilled in them that prophecy of Balaam their ancient enemy, "Lo, the people shall *dwell alone*, and shall not be reckoned among the nations."

But, however the Jews may since have been despised and hated, the choicest trophies which a Roman conqueror could then gather out of all the lands to grace his imperial triumph were the vessels taken from the temple at Jerusalem; and most precious among those spoils, more valuable than the golden candlestick, table, censer, or trumpets, was the LAW THAT WAS GIVEN BY MOSES, which contained the secret of all the prosperity the Jewish nation ever enjoyed, and the violation of

* Josephus, *Wars of the Jews*, b. vii. chap. v. §§ 6, 7.

which had brought upon that people the judgments which had crushed their power, and bound them as captives beneath the Roman yoke.

The graphic pen of a skeptical historian has traced through successive centuries the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire;" and the proudest monuments of Rome's imperial greatness to-day are vast ruins, desolate palaces and broken sculptures, shattered and marred by the vengeance of barbarians, and the destructive accidents of passing ages. The grandeur of Rome has departed. The palaces of the Cæsars lie desolate. The laws which Rome imposed upon the world are buried in the dust of ages, and none are so poor as to yield them allegiance. The dynasty of the Cæsars has sunk into oblivion, and the names of the proudest rulers of earth are black with merited infamy. The world-wide power of the Iron Kingdom has been shattered and divided; but the Jewish nation whose downfall was that day celebrated, whose leader was that day slain, and whose children, sold as slaves, were represented by the ranks of dejected captives which swelled the pomp of their conquerors' triumph, still lives and thrives and multiplies among the nations on the earth. The ceaseless attrition of ages has failed to crush them. The burdens of oppression, "the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune," the disgrace, exile, poverty, and scorn of centuries, have in vain conspired to effect their disintegration and destruction. Rome has fallen, but the Jewish nation still stands. The empire of the Cæsars has perished, but the Jewish people remain. The nations that conquered them, sold them, scattered them and oppressed them, have been shattered into fragments, and all the gods they worshipped are forgotten, or only remembered with contempt, while the conquered people maintain their nationality and remember their fathers' God, and have the

comfort of knowing that His name is still adored in all lands, while the thirty thousand idols of the Roman Pantheon are cast to the bats and the moles, never to be worshiped again.

But though Rome has been sacked, though her temples have been desolated, her altars destroyed, and her laws abolished, yet the Law contained in that Parchment Roll which the Romans brought from the Jewish temple as their proudest trophy in the triumph of Titus, and laid up at last within the imperial palace of the Roman rulers, as the choicest of all the spoils which Roman prowess had won—that Law has been honored and preserved, and rules to-day an empire wider than the wildest dreams of Roman domination, and is written in the hearts and minds of men and women scattered in every land and clime.

Translated into hundreds of languages, printed in thousands of editions, and scattered by hundreds of millions of copies, that law has gone into all the earth, and its words unto the ends of the world. And that law to-day, though spurned and despised by the scoffing, the godless and the unbelieving, unlocks the mystery of Jewish preservation and of Israel's acknowledged greatness, and stands with them as a witness to the faithfulness of God, and to the truth of the revelation he has given. The Roman conquerors are gone; the deities which Titus worshiped in that day of pomp are buried out of sight; but the testimony of Israel, "The Lord our God is one LORD," has gone throughout all lands, and is still sounding forth, lighting up the darkness of heathenism as with a pillar of fire, and leading the van of human progress as a pillar of cloud by day. Over the wreck and ruin of departed empires we read, "All flesh is grass, and the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field;" but in the fulfillment of sacred prophecy, and in the permanence of the law given by Moses, we may read that

though "the grass withereth, and the flower fadeth," yet "the WORD OF OUR GOD shall stand forever."

WHENCE CAME THAT LAW?

Upon the origin of that law general history sheds little light. The sources of other laws are well known. The code of Napoleon, the pandects of Justinian, the decrees of the Roman emperors, the products of Grecian legislation, have come down to us, and we can mark the date and time when they were enacted or decreed. We can trace the history of the British *Magna Charta*, or the American *Declaration of Independence*, the laws of the British Parliament, or the American Congress; but Israel has no record or tradition of any *law-making body*. No parliament or legislature ever convened to enact or establish the statutes which governed the children of Israel. The acts of legislative bodies, and the decrees of monarchs, are numbered and dated, and can be authenticated; but this law stands alone. There is no record of its gradual growth. Various ancient heathen writers declare its Mosaic origin, some asserting that Moses flourished before the Trojan war (B.C. 1184). Jewish tradition, in accordance with their written records, declares that it was received from the Almighty through Moses on Mount Sinai. One thing is certain, if it was *not* thus received there is no record of its origin or reception, and it stands to-day an unexplained enigma—a law without a lawgiver.

LAW AND HARD-TACK.

It is asserted by some that the law of Moses was a forgery and a cheat, that it was not given by God, nor even by Moses, but that it was imposed upon the people at a far later date than the time when it is supposed to have been originated.

But it is not easy to impose spurious laws upon any

nation. Men are jealous of their liberties and their rights. Every Jew was an owner of landed property, and his only title to that property was found in the writings of Moses and Joshua, and in the genealogy of his family, which was carefully preserved. Every law, to be accepted as authoritative, must bear the name of the lawgiver and the date of its enactment; otherwise it would not gain credence or authority. It would not be easy to forge a law and foist it upon any people. Does the history of the world afford an instance of such a proceeding?

Suppose that for experiment's sake, some skeptic should go among his friends and neighbors and tell them that there was a law that for seven days in each year every man, woman, and child in *this* nation should eat "hard-tack," or a peculiar kind of thin hard bread, or biscuit; and that during one week in April every person must use only this kind of bread, whether they had good teeth or poor teeth, or no teeth at all; and that no other sort of bread should be allowed in their houses, under pain of death. Imagine an infidel publishing such a law throughout the community, and saying to every man, woman, and child, "On the fifteenth day of April you will all commence to eat hard-tack; and for seven days no man or woman shall bake, eat, or possess any other kind of bread under the severest penalties." What success would an infidel have in imposing such a law upon his neighbors? They would look upon him at first with silent contempt, or perhaps query if he was not an escaped lunatic. If he persisted in proclaiming such a law, they would inquire as to its origin; they would say, "We never heard of such a law;" they would deny his authority, and they would flatly refuse to obey it.

"Eat hard-tack!" they would say; "we do not like hard-tack. We never have eaten it, and we do not propose to begin. You say there is a *law* that we should eat

this kind of bread; where is this law? who made such a law? and why did no one ever hear of it before?"

What would be the result of the infidel's experiment? Why, a man would go home and say to his wife,—

"I want you to make some bread."

"What kind of bread?"

"Any kind of bread. Make some raised bread, soft bread, saleratus bread, yeast bread, potato bread, wheat bread, rye bread, brown bread,—any kind of bread and every kind of bread *except* hard-tack; that we *will not have, anyhow.* There is an infidel 'crank' around here saying that there is a *law* that for one week no bread shall be baked or eaten in the country except hard-tack, under pain of death; and we propose to let the fool see that he cannot impose his laws upon us."

And so they would eat their bread, and defy the infidel and his law, and show this new teacher that they were not to be deceived or frightened by such a man as he.

And yet to-day there is a people, scattered from one end of the world to the other, who for seven days in each year eat this kind of bread, and have no other bread in their houses. We find these people in Asia, in Africa, in Europe, in America, and in every quarter of the globe; and wherever they are, under the rule of czar or kaiser, emperor or king, in England or in Egypt, in China or in India, in lands of bondage and outrage, or in homes of freedom and prosperity,—wherever you find the Jews, there, in the spring of the year, for a week's time, they not only eat this peculiar kind of bread, but they put every other kind out of their houses. As the time approaches, hundreds and hundreds of barrels of flour pass through the great bakeries,* and are turned out in cakes

*Certain bakeries in this city have been busily engaged recently in preparing unleavened bread for the Passover feast of the Jews. It is expected that *one hundred thousand pounds* will be prepared.—*Philadelphia Christian Instructor*, April, 1885.

about as large as a dinner-plate, and about as thick—and nearly as hard. And this bread is eaten by Jews wherever they are, throughout the entire world. And it is not only eaten by Jews; but among the ruins of Samaria, in Palestine, there is a little remnant of people which have been at enmity with the Jews for nearly twenty-five hundred years, but who yet eat unleavened bread as the Jews do, and at the same time of the year.

Now why does this scattered nation uniformly observe such a custom as this? They say they do it in obedience to their law. But who gave them such a law? And what is the meaning of such an observance? Who had authority to enact such a law? And what reason can be assigned for such a strange requirement?

When those Jewish families gather around their tables where they eat of that unleavened bread with bitter herbs, it is customary for a little child, the youngest in the family, to come to the father and inquire "What is the meaning of this feast?" And the law of Moses says:

"When your children shall say to you, *What mean ye by this service?* then ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel, in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians and delivered our houses." Exodus xii. 26, 27.

In accordance with this law, the father gives an account of the sojourn of Israel in Egypt, of the oppressions which they endured, and of the great deliverance which God wrought in bringing them out with a mighty hand and outstretched arm, with signs and wonders, into their own land. And he tells them that the last meal the Israelites ate in the land of Egypt was a roasted lamb with *unleavened bread*, prepared and eaten in haste,—the blood of the lamb having been sprinkled on the posts of their doors to protect them from the power of the destroying angel, who slew the firstborn of Egypt and *passed over*

the houses whose doors were thus sprinkled with blood; and that, in memory of this *passing over*, they were then commanded to keep the passover feast each year, and for seven days to eat only unleavened bread.

Now why do these Israelites tell this story? When did they begin to tell it? Supposing it to be a lie, who started it? If it is a fraud, or forgery, how was a whole nation imposed upon by such a fraud and such a forgery? Surely, a skeptic of to-day must be exceedingly wise if he can prove that to be false which this people for more than thirty-three hundred years have accepted and commemorated as true. If this story be a falsehood, how comes it to be told in every Jewish home, from one end of the world to the other? Different families of this nation have had no communication with each other for centuries and ages, but yet they all agree in declaring that this passover has been handed down from the time of Moses to the present day; and the Samaritans, with whom the Jews have had no dealings for thousands of years, tell the same story, and read it out of the same books.

Skeptics may deny the *fact* of the Egyptian bondage, of Israel's deliverance, and the passage of the Red Sea; but they cannot deny the existence of the *hard-tack*, for it is here before their eyes. If the Jews were *not* delivered from Egypt, why do they eat this bread one week in every year? The unleavened bread is a *fact*, and for one week in every year every true Jew, old and young, throughout the world, eats no bread but that. He does it in obedience to the law given by Moses, commemorating the miraculous deliverance of Israel from Egypt. If we deny that the law was given, how can we account for its observance? And if we deny the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, how will the infidel explain the hard-tack?

The hard-tack is a present, palpable *fact*, and we can

no more account for its existence without admitting the truth of the books of Moses, than Americans could account for the celebration of the fourth day of July with drums, trumpets, and fire-works, while denying the history of the American Revolution. The skeptic might find discrepancies in American histories, and statements that seemed to him improbable; but if he proceeded to deny the Declaration of Independence, and the leading facts in the history of the American Revolution, every cannon, and drum, and band of music, and sky-rocket, and fire-cracker, and toy pistol, used to celebrate the day, would give the lie to his denials, and prove beyond all possibility of question, that there *was* a Declaration of Independence in 1776, and a Revolutionary War. It would have been impossible for any man to have brought about the celebration of the Fourth of July, with the usages and customs attending it, unless there had been something to celebrate, and something that was worth celebrating.

When the descendants of the "Pilgrim Fathers" hold their annual feast on "Forefathers' Day," in Plymouth, it is said that one of the courses served consists of *five grains of corn*, laid on the plate of each guest, a memorial of that time when, in their early days of poverty and distress, all the corn in the colony was divided, and there were only *five kernels* to each person. No *law* requires the remembrance or celebration of this circumstance. The observance does not date from the time of the Pilgrims; it is not a religious ordinance, nor has it ever been widely observed; nevertheless, it would be hard to persuade any man who had ever been present on such an occasion that there was not *some foundation* for this custom. But the feast of the passover, instituted immediately in connection with the events which it commemorated, and continued without interruption through

all generations, being observed by the entire Jewish nation, though scattered abroad in every land, is an absolute demonstration of the truth of the Mosaic history; since it would have been impossible to invent and impose such laws and usages upon the Jewish nation unless the facts upon which they were based were realities, and the statements which warranted them were true.

So long as the Jews keep the passover, so long it will be impossible for candid persons to deny the story of Israel's deliverance from Egyptian bondage, or to disprove the supernatural origin of the Jewish Law. And so long as the Arch of Titus stands, with the vessels of the Jewish tabernacle represented upon it; so long as every Jew in Rome shuns that arch, and avoids passing under the memorial of his nation's overthrow; so long as the Jewish people, wherever they dwell, keep the passover and observe the Mosaic ordinances,—so long we shall find ourselves linked by *existing facts* and *historical monuments* to that law given by Moses more than three thousand years ago, and which, preserved through all the changes of passing ages, is still working its way among the nations of the earth, and influencing humanity as no other law has ever done.

IS THIS LAW GOOD OR EVIL?

There are few things more remarkable than the opposing conclusions at which different persons will arrive concerning the same thing. For example, there are those who look upon the Law of Moses as the embodiment of sound principles, and abundant political wisdom and sagacity; while others look upon it as a tissue of absurdities and abominations, hardly paralleled in the history of human jurisprudence and imposture. Of course when estimates differ so widely, some one must be mistaken; and there are doubtless serious misapprehensions concerning this matter, in one quarter or another.

The Psalmist prayed, "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law." No man can see much until his eyes are open; and what men see depends quite as much upon their powers of vision as it does upon the things to be seen. Because a blind man sees nothing, it by no means follows that there is nothing to be seen. A near-sighted man is a poor judge of a landscape. Men see what they are accustomed to see, what their eyes are trained to perceive.

Passing through the same street in a city, different persons will see different things. One man sees books and literature, he is a student; another man sees buildings and architecture, he is an architect; another man sees displays of merchandise, he is a merchant; another sees machinery, he is a mechanic; another man sees styles and fashions, he is a tailor or a dandy; another man sees the dramshops, and he is—drunk before night. Man sees what he is trained to see, what he is competent to appreciate, what he is interested in seeing.

Standing in a Western wilderness, the wild Indian sees tracks of deer and buffalo, he is a hunter; another man sees broad acres of fertile land, and makes haste to secure them, he is a farmer; another man, a civil engineer, sees water privileges, marks the site of a city, hears the whirr of a million of spindles, and says, "Here will be a second Lowell or Manchester;" another man goes down to the water-side, and grasping a handful of sand and holding it up to the sunlight, he sees *gold*, and straightway thousands of adventurers go rushing to and fro to find the precious metal.

Why did not the first man see gold? Because he was not trained to see gold. He would not know gold if he did see it. Each man has seen the things which he was trained to see. The hunter saw game; the farmer saw land; the civil engineer saw the city; the gold-digger

saw the gold. Each man saw what he was accustomed to see, and what he was looking for.

An angel, flying over the earth, sees men, and women, and children, and churches ; he hears the voice of prayer and the songs of praise ; he sees the heavens which declare God's glory, and the firmament which showeth his handiwork. Over that same radiant landscape flies a buzzard, and the only thing he sees is a dead mule or a poor old rack-o'-bones of a horse, which staggers and falls, and furnishes a feast for the buzzard and his friends. Each sees the things he is interested in; the eye catches what it has been trained to look for and recognize.

Now it is asserted in various quarters that the Mosaic law and the Old Testament writings connected therewith are absurd, obscene, and oppressive; and that the acts done under that law, and professedly by divine direction, were, in themselves considered, unjust, unwise, and unworthy of the character of a great and good Creator and Governor. Others, on the other hand, of equal intelligence and acquaintance with the facts in the case, make directly opposing assertions. In such circumstances, to what conclusion shall we arrive? The difference cannot be in the law,—it must be in the men who read it. Both look at the same landscape; some see one class of objects, and others see things entirely different. Which class sees things as they are? Or are they both mistaken in their views of things ?

HAVE WE ANY RULE OF JUDGMENT?

It is necessary in every argument to reach some point of agreement, as a basis of our reasonings. We must agree in something before we can argue about anything. Some primary premises must be laid down as a basis of all controversy. Can we agree on anything?

If there is no God, if no law has been given by him, if Moses was a myth, and man a monkey, then of course

all moral considerations must be set aside; and then what rule have we for judging or condemning the acts recorded in connection with the Mosaic law? If God has never said, "Thou shalt not steal," what is there wrong in stealing? Monkeys have been in the habit of stealing, from time immemorial, and no one claims that it is sinful for a monkey to steal. At what point and by what means does man, the descendant and heir of the monkey, forfeit his hereditary right to help himself to everything which he sees, at pleasure? It is not wrong for a monkey to steal. That is his privilege, his right. Why did not his descendants inherit this, with other ancestral rights? And if so, how absurd it is to charge men with wrong for doing what had been the natural right of all men from immemorial ages, a right which was handed down to them from their brutal ancestors, and which they had done nothing to forfeit. If the Ten Commandments are a fable, and the Sermon on the Mount a fantasy, the law a humbug, and the gospel a dream, why should *not* men steal, lie, and deceive at pleasure?

It is charged that the Jews under the law of Moses were guilty of great immoralities. But why should they be blamed for that? If the laws enforcing purity and forbidding vice were fabulous and deceptive from beginning to end; if the teachings of Jesus Christ are entirely void of all authority; why should *not* men disregard all such imaginary restrictions, and conduct their affairs after their own sweet wills? Monkeys, apes and baboons have exhibited no particular squeamishness concerning matters of this kind. They have no rule, no law, but that which springs from their own desires and inclinations. They are a law unto themselves. They have needed neither priests nor magistrates to sanction their unions. Why should the Israelites be blamed for any irregularity in their social relations, if they were only following in the

steps of the monkeys from whom infidels say they were descended, and whose examples some who profess to be their progeny seem still quite willing to follow?

ARE MEN RESPONSIBLE BEINGS?

It is impossible and unreasonable to condemn and judge irresponsible beings by commandments and regulations addressed to beings who are morally responsible. We cannot take both positions. If we deny moral responsibility we must stop abusing Moses and the Israelites for doing wrong. If we have no sort of guide by which we can determine what *is* right and what is wrong, then no one is to be blamed, whatever they may do, and consequently Moses and the Israelites were perfectly justifiable in all their acts; for "whatever is is right." Suppose the Israelites *did* commit the grossest outrages and were guilty of the vilest crimes; suppose they slaughtered and butchered without mercy men and women and children; suppose their law outraged all principles of justice and truth and righteousness and decency; what of it? If there is no power but Force; if there is no Supreme Ruler and superior law; if all progress is attainable only by the survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence, one thing is certain, the Jewish nation *has* survived, while the others have gone to the wall. Hence they must be considered as the *fittest*, and their acts must be interpreted in accordance with that principle. Why, then, in the name of common sense, should men go brawling about the country, abusing Moses and the Israelites for committing crimes and perpetrating cruelties, if they have no proof that the acts committed *were* crimes and cruelties, and if they were only carrying out their natural passions and appetites, and doing what they had a perfect right to do, according to the laws of nature under which they were created and in accordance with which they lived? Suppose they *were* cruel, brutal, and unreasonable, were they

any more so than are the "laws of nature" which govern all things? Suppose they destroyed without discrimination, mercy or justice? Is not that just the way the god of nature is doing every day? Is there any reason in a whirlwind? any mercy in an earthquake? any compassion in a cyclone? any pity in a famine or a pestilence? If we charge the God of the Bible with cruelty, brutality, and unreasonableness, does the god of nature behave himself any better? or are the laws of nature more merciful, gracious, compassionate, or righteous? Upon what principle can skeptics abuse Moses for doing just those things which nature herself has been doing from unknown ages down to the present time? Surely, that is a lame kind of logic which abuses Moses and the Jews for acts which are forbidden by no law, but which are in accordance with all men's ancient rights and usages, from their monkey ancestors down; and which are in strict harmony with what is done by nature and the god of nature every day we live.

If the law of Moses is a fable, a forgery, and a fraud, then the principles contained in that law cannot be used by infidels to impeach or accuse the men to whom that law was given. If there *are* no principles of truth and righteousness and justice; if we have nothing to guide us but the instincts derived from brutal ancestors; then on what principle can we question or condemn any act committed by any person, under any circumstances? There is no law, and there can be no transgression. But if we admit the existence of a God, and if he has implanted a law in the human heart, or inscribed it on tables of stone, then we have a basis upon which we may argue. If we do not admit these primary facts, we are left to flounder in a quagmire without a bottom or shore.

If there is no God but nature; if man has neither creator nor governor; if the rights of property, now protected by law and guarded by the sanction of solemn oaths, are

based upon absurd and groundless traditions; then what is to hinder any man falling back upon his original rights, derived from his remote ancestors, and stealing, right and left, whatever he can lay his hands on? And should he succeed in plundering a government, and thus robbing fifty or sixty millions of people of their rights, through crooked contracts and villainous frauds, he would be perfectly justifiable in doing it, and in invoking the aid of some brilliant lawyer who agreed with him that Moses was mistaken when he declared that God had said, "Thou shalt not steal," and who would gladly aid him to escape punishment, and divide with him the profits of the job.

It is true these principles do not work on a large scale. So long as the majority of the people are honest, a few thieves can exhibit their enterprise and carry out their principles with apparent advantage to themselves. If, however, the practice of stealing should come to be universal, the novelty of the thing would pass away, and we should find ourselves back in the realms of barbarism, and brutality. And no principle which if universally accepted and fully carried out would degrade humanity, shipwreck civilization, and disorganize society, is worthy of acceptation by men who have anything to lose or anything to hope for.

All theories which deny divine authority and moral responsibility tend directly to barbarism; nor can any true civilization be found outside the influence of the law of Moses and the gospel of Christ. The infidel world may be defied to find a place on this planet ten miles square, where a decent man can live in decency, comfort, and security, supporting and educating his children unspoiled and unpolluted, enjoying the comforts of family life, and the advantages of respectable society—a place where age is reverenced, infancy protected, manhood respected, womanhood honored, and human life held in

due regard—where the revelation of the God of Abraham has not gone before and cleared the way, and laid the foundations of society, and made civilization, decency, and security possible. And as no decent society can be found where the law of God is unknown, so no such society can be perpetuated where God's law is discarded and disregarded. Persons who, under the influence of divine revelation, have been trained to the practice of virtue and piety in early life, may not always cast off its restraints under the influence of skepticism in later years. But let the influence of such training *die out*, and the practice of infidelity will soon prove the ruin of society.*

If we then turn away from theories so revolting, impracticable and dangerous, if we admit that there is

A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN RIGHT AND WRONG,

between vice and virtue, sin and holiness, good and evil, we then naturally inquire, What is the cause of this difference? Does it have its origin in "the nature of things?" Then who is responsible *for* "the nature of things?" And who gave things such a nature, based upon moral principles, and in harmony with right, and opposed to wrong?

If it be said that this distinction between right and wrong is *innate* in the human constitution, then the ques-

* Thoughtful skeptics may well ponder the words of James Russell Lowell, who, at a festival in honor of the poet Browning, said, in reply to the severe language of a speaker against certain forms of religious faith:

"I have always been a liberal thinker, and have allowed others who differed with me to think as they liked—but at the same time I fear that when we indulge ourselves in the amusement of going without a religion, we are not, perhaps, aware how much we are sustained at present by an enormous mass all about us, of religious feeling and religious conviction, so that whatever it may be safe for *us* to think, for us who have had great advantages, and have been brought up in such a way that a certain moral direction has been given to our character, *I do not know what would become of the less favored classes of mankind* if *they* undertook to play the same game."

tion arises, Who made the human constitution, and who endowed it with the consciousness of right and wrong, and the ability to discern between the two? Certainly man must derive that moral nature which approves of right and disapproves of wrong, from some higher Being, who also distinguishes between right and wrong, and who hates the wrong and approves the right.

An unconscious machine cannot produce a conscious being: a dead thing cannot give birth to a living person; and a being who had no moral sense, or care concerning right and wrong, would not know how to originate a being possessed of a conscience which, properly enlightened, approves the right and condemns the wrong.

If man possesses moral sense, and has innate ideas of righteousness, they must be the gift of a righteous Creator, who is not only the source of life and being, but the fountain of truth and righteousness, the Father of lights, from whom man receives not only existence, but intelligence, conscience, and every good and perfect gift.

If, then, it be admitted that there *is* a God, and that man is a responsible creature, possessed of moral sense, and capable of perceiving the difference between good and evil, right and wrong, truth and falsehood, vice and virtue, we are then prepared to inquire whether the things narrated in the books of Moses are in accordance with the principles of natural righteousness and virtue, or whether they are impious, outrageous, and worthy of all condemnation. Hence we inquire,

WAS THE LAW OF MOSES A BAD LAW?

It is useless to undertake to settle this question by mere general assertions. It must be discussed in detail. Wild, vague charges prove nothing. We have simply to take up, one by one, the accusations preferred, and compare them with the facts in the case. This may be a tedious

method, but it is the only method that can be satisfactory. It is easy to condense into a sentence a string of epithets, or a series of accusations, and snap them off from the end of a nimble tongue, giving no authority for the assertions and no opportunity to inquire into the facts—thus beguiling the simple and fooling the gullible; but such oratorical displays serve no good purpose. They may confuse some who wish to be confused, and convince some who are willing to be convinced; they may raise that "laughter in the mouth of fools," which is "like the crackling of thorns under a pot;" they may serve to fill the pockets of a glib-tongued blasphemer, but they do not work conviction in honest minds, nor satisfy the candid thinker who is honestly inquiring, "What is truth?"

Let us then calmly consider a few of the objections which are continually being made against the authority of the books of Moses, and so against the authority of the entire Scriptures. And first let us inquire,

IS THE BIBLE A VILE BOOK?

First, we are told that the Bible is a bad book, obscene, indelicate, and unfit to be read. Before this grave charge can be established we must consider that the Bible was written in a different age and country from our own. There are countries to-day where persons can freely appear in public with such costume, or such lack of costume, as would in this country at once subject them to imprisonment for indecent exposure. Customs differ in different countries; and what is improper in one country may give no offense in another. So there may be a simplicity, or even a barbarism, of language, which, though indelicate to our ears, may have been entirely consistent with purity and propriety at the time and in the countries where it was written; as there may also be delicacy of speech joined with prurient thought and corrupt behavior.

Again, the words which appear to us indelicate in the Bible are *not* the words *written* by Moses or the prophets, but they are English words used by the translators; and they are words which were used in respectable society when the Bible was translated in 1611, that is, in the time of Shakespeare. And for every expression in the Bible which seems objectionable, we could probably find a dozen in the writings of Shakespeare which would not pass current in modern society; though it does not appear that much fault was found with them in those days.

In the year 1400 died Geoffrey Chaucer, a London gentleman, a favorite of royalty, a high government official, and "the father of English poetry;" placed by Southey "in the first rank, with Spenser, Shakespeare and Milton," and described by Hallam as "our greatest poet in the middle ages." His poems are called "a well of English undefiled;" but what infidel would be bold enough to read a page selected from them at random, before a promiscuous audience to-day?

There are books written by a clergyman of the church of England, in the last half of the eighteenth century, which, though once widely popular, could not now be read in public. Times change, and under the influence of the Bible and Christianity language changes with them. A century ago language was used in parlors that would now be hardly tolerable in bar-rooms and stables.

The objection lies, not against the Bible, but against the *English language*, which grows purer as the Bible is circulated among English-speaking peoples. Chaucer wrote when England had no Bible; Shakespeare wrote before King James' translation was published; Sterne wrote when there was not a Bible Society in the world. The Bible was translated into the purest English then known. No book of that age will compare with it in purity, and the influence of the Bible and Christianity

has elevated the language and the taste of the people till men object to language which in 1611 was deemed unobjectionable.

Moreover, Moses gave to Israel a *law;* and a law must describe and specify the crimes which it prohibits. Not only the statute laws, but the standard medical treatises of every civilized country, contain expressions which might be counted inappropriate for promiscuous reading. The law of Moses deals not only with *crimes*, but with the *public health.* If it forbids crime, it must describe crime; and it must do it, not in the delicate euphemisms by which French writers convey the vilest thoughts in the politest words, but in plain, honest phrases that can be understood by common people.

We maintain a semblance of delicacy when treating on these subjects, by using foreign words, or terms derived *from* foreign tongues, and not well understood by common people. The strangeness of such language and our imperfect acquaintance with its meaning, deprives it of the appearance of coarseness. But let the *obscure and foreign words* used in law and in medicine be translated into the plainest and simplest English for the common people, and there is not a charge of this kind brought against the Hebrew Scriptures but could be urged with equal force against our statute laws, standard medical literature, and against the old English writers of both prose and poetry;—all of which are purity itself compared with the writings of heathen authors who had no Bibles, —such as the Greek and Roman classics which are studied to-day in colleges and academies.

Hence the charge that the Bible is a bad book, "obscene, beastly, and vulgar"—made with infinite grace by the eloquent blasphemer whose name is said to have headed a petition for the repeal of the law designed to prohibit the circulation of obscene literature by his fellow

infidels through the medium of the United States mails —falls to the ground. Surely, if the Bible is such a book as he describes, it would be taken up and circulated by his followers and supporters, and catalogued with the numerous obscene books and pictures which are advertised upon the covers of his blasphemous lectures, for circulation among his followers, who, if they found the Bible adapted to their peculiar tastes, would doubtless peruse it with fresh interest, and circulate it with unexampled zeal.

There is one reason why they will never do this. While their orator asserts that "few books have been published containing more moral filth than this inspired Word of God," he spoils the circulation of the book among *his* friends by *adding* that "these stories are not redeemed by a *single flash of wit or humor*. They never rise above the dull details of stupid vice." Here is the trouble with the Bible. If it treated sin as a joke; if its pages were punctuated, like the lectures of this blasphemer, with "laughter," "applause," and "great laughter;" if it made clowns roar over crimes, and jested and sneered at infamies which the laws of every civilized and decent country condemn and punish,—it would then be much more acceptable to him and his jovial followers. But the Bible does not deal with sin in this way; neither do the laws of the land. The statutes against vice are "not enlivened by a single flash of wit or humor." Sin is no joke, and no matter for joking. The laws promulgated, the sins condemned, and the punishments recorded, do not furnish amusing reading for infidels. They are not enlivened with flashes of "wit and humor." They deal with stern and awful realities, and warn men to turn away from sin, that they may escape ruin in this world, and perdition in the world to come. Infidels mock at sin, scoff at religion, and sneer at damnation, and then complain that the Bible, while rebuking and forbidding acts

which wreck families, destroy lives, and ruin souls, does not *enliven the subject* "with a *single flash of wit or humor*." Unless greatly misrepresented, it is probable that no living man has shown greater skill, or had more experience, in the art of enlivening obscene stories with "flashes of wit and humor" than the man who denounces the Bible as "obscene, beastly, and vulgar," and "not redeemed by a single flash of wit or humor." Nero fiddled while Rome was on fire; and infidels complain that the Bible does not crack jokes over sins which desolate nations, and destroy soul and body, for this world and the next.

WAS THE LAW OF MOSES A CRUEL LAW?

It is claimed that the law of Moses was an *exceedingly cruel law*, full of wrath, vengeance, and bloodshed; that it established a terrible tyranny, and was oppressive in the extreme. What are the facts in the case?

In the Jewish law, corporal punishment was sometimes inflicted, but under rigid restrictions. It is not very long since the practice of *flogging* was abolished in the armies and navies of some of the foremost nations of modern civilization. Any one who has read accounts of persons being flogged in modern times one, two, three, four, or five *hundred lashes* with the cat-o'-nine-tails; of sailors being "flogged through the fleet;" or who has read the accounts of the floggings inflicted with the knout and other instruments of torture,—will perhaps be prepared to appreciate the "barbarity" of the law of Moses, which said: "It shall be, if the wicked man be worthy to be beaten, that the judge shall cause him to lie down, and to be beaten *before his face*, according to his fault, by a certain number. *Forty stripes he may give him, and not exceed.*" Deut. xxv. 2, 3.

It is true that modern civilization has largely discarded

the lash, and yet in some cases it has been deemed expedient to return to it. When the London garroters were robbing people on the right hand and on the left, the magistrates sentenced them not only to imprisonment, but to a sound flogging; and when once the precious scoundrels felt the tingle of the lash upon their worthless hides, garroting suddenly went out of fashion. Wife-beating has been treated in a similar manner: and the lash is still retained in some cases of criminal discipline. And it is yet an open question whether it should be entirely discarded. Modern law takes men from their families and friends, leaving their wives to toil and their children to suffer, and politely ushers them into prison, keeping them in a gloomy cell for months, making honest men work to pay taxes for their support, turning them out at last, possibly finished rogues, perhaps broken in health and crushed in spirit, but bearing the brand of crime and imprisonment upon them. The law of Moses, without jails, prisons, or penitentiaries, settled the whole matter at once with an infliction of *less* than forty stripes, and the man went about his business and supported his family; his back got well, and he learned to obey the laws. This was Jewish law. Are we certain that the laws of modern civilization are greatly superior to these ordinances? And to what country can infidelity point as an example of humanity, that has not been for generations under the influence of this same Mosaic law?

By an act passed in 22 Henry VIII., *vagrants* were to be "carried to some market town or other place, and there tied to the end of a cart and beaten with whips through such market town or other place, till the back should be *bloody by reason of such whipping*" (Burn's Justice, vol. v. 501). And there are abundant records in England of the whipping of *men*, with their *wives* and *children*, *widows* and *maidens*, who were "*vagrants*" or wandering

beggars. When the writings of John Taylor, "the water poet," were published, in 1630, he says:

> "In London, and within a mile I ween,
> There are of jails and prisons full eighteen,
> And *sixty whipping posts* and stocks and cages." *

The law of Moses countenances no such cruelties and barbarities as flogging women and children, or any one else for poverty or begging. In its enactments principles of humanity prevail. If we compare the Jewish law with the customs of the nations around them, the difference will be manifest. The kings of Israel had no "burning, fiery furnace" for the punishment of offenders, like the king of Babylon; no "den of lions," like the Medes and the Persians. They were not accustomed to bore out peoples' eyes, or cut off their hands, like the Assyrians. The law of Moses knew nothing of crucifixion, which was practiced among the Romans, the horrors and pains of which extended to the third, and sometimes to the seventh day. It knew nothing of punishment by torture on the rack, of breaking on the wheel, of impaling, of flaying alive, of roasting over a slow fire, of drowning, of exposure to serpents and wild beasts, of tearing in pieces by wild horses, of drawing and quartering, of exposing upon the gibbet, or fixing human heads and hands over gates, on walls, or in public places; or any of the similar cruel and horrible inflictions which abounded even in civilized countries almost down to the present time.

The punishments prescribed by the law of Moses were restitution, stripes, servitude, the sword, and stoning; and in certain cases *burning* was inflicted, but this is not said to be burning *alive*, but was probably the burning of those who had been previously put to death. Persons *after* being slain, were sometimes hung up, and thus publicly

*Chambers' *Book of Days*, May 5.

exhibited, but they were not to remain exposed over night, but must at once be buried.

When we consider the severities of the laws of ancient Babylon, Assyria, and Egypt, we cannot deny that the Jewish law, as a whole, was moderate and merciful beyond any law then in existence, and also beyond most of the laws of modern times. Of course a code of martial laws, for the government of a people just escaped from slavery, in a country where prisons, jails, and reformatories were unknown, and where punishment must of necessity be summary, would necessarily differ materially from laws established under different circumstances. But in spite of all these difficulties, the law of Moses must still be regarded as a law where mercy rejoiced against judgment.

It was not, indeed, a rose-water remedy for the wild disorders of a barbarous age, where society must protect itself or perish, and must protect itself by energetic measures, because no others would avail. Modern refinement has reduced the number of capital crimes to a minimum, and by the allowance of various delays and evasions has rendered the detection and punishment of the guilty infrequent and almost impossible, while murders have increased beyond parallel.*

Under the Jewish law there were *four classes* of capital crimes: idolatry, which was treason against God, the Supreme Ruler; deliberate murder; drunkenness joined with persistent disobedience and abuse of parents; and gross and degrading crimes arising from the indulgence of unbridled lusts, impairing or destroying the life of the

*Skeptics boast of the rapid progress of infidel and atheistic ideas. Their boast is doubtless true, for the papers state that there were more than *twice as many homicides* in the United States in the year 1884 as there were in the year 1883. This indicates that some men are coming to believe that the declaration that God said "THOU SHALT NOT KILL" was one of the "Mistakes of Moses." If these are the first fruits, "What shall the harvest be?"

future generations, and so sapping the very foundations of human society.

The capital crimes in these four classes number about seventeen. We start at such a number, forgetting that an army of six hundred thousand men cannot exist without discipline, and that, under military law at the present time, capital offenses are almost numberless, and men are tried by drum-head court-martial, and promptly executed, for offenses too numerous to mention.

Before our skeptical friends lose themselves in rhapsodies over the sanguinary barbarism of the Mosaic law, let us call to mind a few cold facts. Great Britain has been progressing for a number of centuries, and was not in utter barbarism two hundred years ago. And yet, after three thousand years in which to improve on the Mosaic law, there were at the beginning of this nineteenth century *more than ten times as many capital offenses under the laws of Great Britain as there ever were under the laws of Moses.*

Of course the *earliest* laws of Great Britain inflicted capital punishment for certain crimes, probably more numerous than those that were punished with death under Mosaic law; but as we pass down the ages we find that the number of capital crimes was largely increased from time to time by new and stringent legislation.

Under the reign of the Plantagenets, from 1154 to 1485, *four* crimes were made capital. In the time of the Tudors, from 1485 to 1603, *twenty-seven* more crimes were added to the number punishable with death. Under the reign of the Stuarts *thirty-six* offenses were made capital; and under the house of Brunswick *one hundred and fifty-four more* crimes were made punishable with death; an increase of 233 capital crimes between the years 1154 and 1807, at which time *nearly three hundred crimes* of various grades were punishable by death in Great Britain.

Men were punishable with death for stealing twelve-pence-ha'penny, for stealing a sheep, shooting game, or coining money. Soldiers and sailors found begging without testimonials of discharge from service were punishable with death, and a host of trivial offenses were made capital crimes.

About 1809, Romilly procured the passage of a bill to repeal the statute which made death the penalty for stealing from the person. In 1810 he tried unsuccessfully to secure the repeal of the statute which made stealing from a shop *five shillings' worth of goods* a crime punishable with death. The death penalty for coining was repealed in 1832. The death penalty for stealing horses, sheep, and cattle, and for larceny in dwellings to the amount of *five shillings*, was repealed in July, 1832. The death penalty for forgery or for uttering counterfeit money, was repealed August 15, 1832; that for house-breaking, August, 1833; and finally the offenses punishable with death by civil law in Great Britain were reduced to ten.

But before this reform took place, convictions were numerous and deaths frequent. Ireland in 1822 had 101 executions; and since 1810 more than fourteen hundred persons were executed in Wales for offenses *not now punishable with death.* For such offenses, in the four years from 1828 to 1831, not less than 3786 persons were *condemned to death*, and 66 were executed.*

The humane skeptic who devotes his time to blaspheming Moses' law for its cruelties, and attributes them to the barbarism of by-gone ages, would do well to explain how it comes that in the land of Shakspeare and Milton, and in the enlightenment of the nineteenth century, there were *more than ten times as many crimes punishable with death* as under the law given by Moses to those Israelitish "barbarians."

* See Robert Rantoul's *Addresses*, pp. 492, 493, 513.

It will not do to say that this is the work of a *Christian government*, for there *are* no Christian governments, and never were; and besides, the stream cannot rise higher than the fountain, and any legislation derived from Christian sources must *keep within the limits laid down in the Scriptures.* But instead of this, here we have in civilized lands, and in the beginning of the nineteenth century, laws *tenfold more severe* than those recorded in that old Bible with which infidels find so much fault. And in lands where the Bible has been unknown the state of things has been and *still is tenfold worse*, notwithstanding all the fine theories of skeptics concerning human progression and perfectibility. Infidelity has never yet civilized a nation, and it will be impossible to find civilization, education, morality and security on earth, outside of the Holy Scriptures.

When in 1802 Welsh children had to walk seven miles to find a Bible in which to read over the preacher's text; when a man in Nova Scotia had to travel sixty miles over the snow to obtain a copy of the Word of God; when in all the world there was not a single society for the translation and diffusion of the Living Oracles in various tongues; when a pocket "reference Bible" had never been seen, and when there were probably not more than four million copies of the Scriptures on earth,—it was *then* that life was held so cheaply in Great Britain that death was the penalty of hundreds of crimes.

In 1804 the British and Foreign Bible Society was founded; within four years *forty-three editions* of the Scriptures, in *seventeen* different languages, were published or in progress,—making a grand total of one hundred and ninety-six thousand copies of the Sacred Book.* And the *very next year* commenced the agitation which, keeping pace with Bible circulation, purged the statute books

* See *Reasons for My Hope*, by H. L. Hastings, pp. 69-71.

of those sanguinary laws which cursed and disgraced the nation. And in the last generation what man has done more in all Great Britain to reform abuses, lift up the poor and the weak, and protect them from wrong, than Lord Shaftesbury, for more than thirty years president of the British and Foreign Bible Society?

The trouble with civilized lands is not that they are controlled by the principles contained in the Scriptures, but that there is so much heathenism still left among them; and hence there is need of severe and rigorous government. Nations which are unfit for liberty must submit to tyranny and severity; and none *are* fit for freedom but those whom the truth has made free. Hence governments established over ill-regulated populations must sometimes be administered with rigor; and this rigor is increased by tyrannical and foolish rulers, who neither know how to make laws nor to execute them wisely. Human nature is much the same to-day as in the time of Moses. The legal penalties of crime in the most enlightened nations, though varied in accordance with varying circumstances and not always for the better, have not had their severity greatly moderated since Moses gave his law.

England was not alone in inflicting severe punishments. I have seen quite recently a dingy-looking little note for *four shillings*, issued by the General Assembly of Pennsylvania in 1777, on which is printed, "*To counterfeit this is death.*"

There are probably to-day, under the civil and military laws of the United States of America, more crimes punishable with death, than there were under the law given by Moses three thousand years ago. Men have been punished with death for falling asleep, after marching all day with knapsacks on their backs. Men have been punished with death for going to see their wives, or their

mothers, or their children. Men have been punished with death for writing letters, for making signals, for conveying intelligence, for crossing lines, and for refusing to obey orders which were perhaps unreasonable. It would take a long time to relate the offenses punishable with death under martial law in this country. And yet the law Moses gave was a martial law. He was at the head of a vast army, and discipline must be observed.

To-day, on the back of every bank and government note issued in the United States, may be read the statement that counterfeiting that note, or having in possession *any paper* made in imitation of that note, is punishable with a fine of five thousand dollars, and imprisonment for fifteen years. Moses never fined a man five thousand dollars, or imprisoned him fifteen years, for *having a quire of blank paper* in his possession. Moses never killed a man for stealing a sheep or killing a deer, nor for stealing thirteen pence. Moses never condemned a man to death for writing another man's name on a piece of paper. Moses never punished a soldier or a sailor with death for begging. If two thousand years hence, some man who had lived to years of discretion and common sense, should find a copy of Moses' law, and a volume containing the laws of Great Britain and America, instead of abusing Moses for his barbarism, and traveling the country to tell about his mistakes, he would be astonished at the degeneracy of the human race, which after more than three thousand years' progression, enacted laws far more severe and sanguinary than those which Moses gave to the Jews in the wilderness of Sinai.

STONING FOR SABBATH BREAKING.

But it is said that Moses commanded a man to be put to death for gathering sticks on the Sabbath. Precisely so; and any general commanding an army might have

done the same under similar circumstances. A law had been enacted in the interest of the poor and the down-trodden, giving every laborer, every man, and every beast a weekly day of rest. That law was salutary. For the lack of its observance thousands of persons to-day are in untimely graves, and millions are dragging out weary, slavish lives. The law was a good one, and its observance of immense importance to the well-being of that people. This man openly and knowingly broke the law concerning the Sabbath. There is no evidence that death was the prescribed or ordinary penalty for a violation of this law. In fact, no definite penalty was attached to its violation; and hence the offender was arrested and placed in confinement "because it was *not declared* what should be done to him." Num. xv. 34. In any well disciplined army, a man for such a violation of military orders would be liable to be shot on the spot, or to be tried by drum-head court martial, sentenced to death for disobedience to orders, and promptly executed, as a warning to others, to prevent mutiny and anarchy in the camp. Had this open and flagrant violation of a wholesome law passed unpunished, discipline would have been at an end, and the people would have been robbed of the benefits of a weekly rest. Hence it was decided that the man should be taken without the *camp*, and put to death. It was a strictly military measure, and prompted by a military necessity. The death of that man, in all probability, saved the lives of thousands of others who would have been worked to death without it; just as a few rounds of cannon shot promptly poured into the midst of a yelling mob, avoids the havoc of an insurrection, and saves the lives of hundreds of innocent persons.

It does not appear that this offense was subsequently or ordinarily punished with death. The law was made in the interests of the people, and especially of the poor.

The man-servant and the maid-servant, the ox, and the ass, all had the benefit of a weekly day of rest. And though the Jewish teachers by their traditions added greatly to the strictness of the law, repeatedly complaining of the Saviour and his disciples for breaking the Sabbath day, He taught them that the Sabbath was made for the *man*, and not the man for the Sabbath; it was designed for man's repose and delight, rather than to be an instrument of oppression, bondage, and death.

But at this time, when the Jews were just delivered from the unremitting toil of Egyptian bondage, they needed rest; and they doubtless prized it as those cannot who, living all their years under the beneficent arrangement of a weekly rest, in their pride and self-sufficiency seek to rebel at all authority, and to cast away one of the greatest boons which God ever conferred upon working-men, and one which has to do with man's highest interests, physical, mental, and moral.

The one man whose insubordination imperiled such an institution was stoned. The man died, but the Rest-day survived, and that day of rest is worth more to humanity than any one man, or any ten men, especially such men as those are who resist and rebel against a law so wholesome and beneficent as that which grants to every weary toiler a weekly day of rest.

AN EYE FOR AN EYE.

It is complained that the law of Moses sanctioned the ancient and well-nigh universal principle called *lex talionis*, or *like for like*. Thus it was written: "Thou shalt give eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe." Exod. xxi. 24, 25. This law was not peculiar to Moses. It existed long afterward among the polished Athenians, and Solon, the wise legislator, enacted that

whoever put out the eye of a one-eyed person should for his crime have *both his own eyes put out.* It also formed a part of the famous Twelve Tables of the Roman law, though afterwards it was changed to a fine. The law of Moses did not allow *individuals* to retaliate;—the legal tribunal must pronounce the sentence, and inflict the punishment prescribed.

Are we sure that such a law was a bad one? If a rich man gouged out his neighbor's eye, he could not walk into court and settle by paying a paltry fine: he must have *his own eye taken out*, and so learn just how pleasant it was to lose an eye. One such lesson would teach that man to leave other people's eyes alone. Probably one such lesson would serve for a whole community. If a man knocked out another man's tooth, one of his own teeth were extracted, and he thus had a taste of his own medicine. No rich man could assault, or bruise, or maim his poorer neighbor, and atone for it by *fine.* He must receive *upon his own person* the punishment for his crimes. Whoever wilfully destroyed the life of another man must lose his own life. Any offense against property could be settled by fines or other punishments. There was no hanging for thieving, or any crime against property; property went for property, but the murderer must give life for life.

Could any law have been devised more just in its character, or more salutary in its influence on such a community, than this? It is true that the Saviour taught a more excellent way, but not a more *just* way. Moses proclaimed *law* and *justice* for the government of a nation; Christ preached *love* and *mercy* for the guidance of individuals who take his yoke upon them. Law to rule a *nation* is one thing, and gospel to guide *individuals* is quite another thing. And where the gospel has not gone, or is not obeyed, *law* is necessary to preserve public order

and render life safe and existence in this world tolerable.

But it was not required that this law should in all cases be rigidly executed. A man who had offended might make terms with the injured person, and if he could satify *him* by a fine or payment of damages, the matter could be ended. Such satisfactions were, and still are, common in the East;—in fact, so common that Moses found it needful to *forbid* them in a case of deliberate murder, saying "Ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer." Num. xxxv. 31. This law, "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," stood as a perpetual guardian over the poor. It counted every man's *person* sacred. Brutal men are cowardly, and such a law as this naturally restrained their brutality, and protected the helpless against assaults and violence. Are we sure that modern lawmakers have made great progress in this line of legislation? Are our laws which allow a drunken brute to kick and beat and maim his wife, and as a punishment for it send him to prison for a few weeks—where, at the expense of honest, hard-working men, he has better food and care than he had before, and is then sent forth to repeat his offenses—so much superior to the law which provided wound for wound, and stripe for stripe, as skeptics would have us imagine?

Surely the descendants of men who less than a century ago punished nearly *three hundred crimes with death*, and who would hang a man like a dog for stealing a horse or a sheep,* need not go back three thousand years to pour out the vials of their wrath upon a lawgiver whose penal code only specified *seventeen capital offenses;*

* "It is not so very long since both the theory and the practice of British jurisprudence might be expressed in the Hebrew formula of 'an eye for an eye,' or in such maxims as 'a man for a sheep,' 'a man for a guinea,' nay, mark it, ye who stigmatize the Mosaic law of retaliation as savoring of barbaric rudeness, '*a man for twelvepence-farthing.*"—E. C. Wines, *Commentaries on the Laws of the Ancient Hebrews*, p. 273.

and under which no man was punishable with death for *any* crime which only affected the *property* or pecuniary interests of the community.

PUNISHMENT OF CRIMES AGAINST PURITY.

Skeptics complain bitterly of the stern judgments which the Mosaic law visited upon crimes against morality and chastity; which many infidels do not regard as worthy of severe punishment. There was reason for this severity. The author of that ancient law understood the deadly nature of sin, even in its incipient forms. He knew that the wages of sin was death, even though the sin might be respectable or pleasurable.

Speaking to a friend, of an acquaintance of former years, a man said, "There seems to have been some fatality attending him and his family. He died, and his wife died, and his children, one after another, all died in early life." His friend did not tell him what he well knew, that in his youth that man was contaminated and stained by vicious indulgences, and that in those early years could doubtless be found the secret of that "fatality" which not only blasted his own life, bringing him down to the grave in his brown hair, but also wrecked the lives of his wife and children, and utterly extinguished his race, at a time when he should have been in manhood's prime.

Against such a crime as this, for which modern law has neither name nor punishment, the sternest justice is the truest mercy. The murder of an individual is a light thing compared with indulgence in sin which may result in sowing seeds of anguish, disease, and death through a whole household, blasting the life of a family, and blotting a race out of existence.

Under the law of Moses, crimes against virtue and morality were sternly dealt with, greatly to the disgust of modern infidels, many of whom, while jealous of the

rights of property, and stern in their condemnation of crimes of violence, would condone other sins which the law of Moses vigorously condemned. But since vicious indulgences in their effects upon individuals and society are often more deadly than murder itself, nothing can be more debasing and ruinous to communities than such sins. An hour of dissipation and debauchery may lay the foundation for unutterable pain and sorrow, not only bringing years of anguish to the guilty reveler, but condemning to suffering and death innocent persons whose lives are blasted by his transgressions. The legislation of short-sighted man allows the seeds of death to be sown, and only interferes with the ingathering of the horrible harvest. But the Author of the Mosaic law, beholding the end from the beginning, could see how the sin which to-day seems so light, would scatter blight and sorrow and darkness over the race; and as a preventive measure, God's law inflicts the severest punishment at the beginning, to prevent the untold calamities that are sure to come at the end. And it was to clear the ground of the horrible abominations of heathenism, and make purity and decency possible in one little central spot on earth, thus opening the door of blessing to other lands and peoples, that God decreed the utter destruction of

THE SEVEN NATIONS OF CANAAN.

Infidels never weary of finding fault with the conduct of the Israelites in entering Canaan and dispossessing and destroying the seven nations who dwelt there. No language is too severe, in their estimation, to describe the wickedness of the children of Israel in driving out the Canaanites.

We do not hear any complaint on the part of skeptics about other nations who have immigrated, and dispossessed the inhabitants of different lands. Indeed it seems

quite in the natural order of events for one nation, vigorous and energetic, to invade and overcome another nation, luxurious and debauched. When Rome becomes utterly corrupt and lost to virtue and patriotism, the Goths and Vandals are usually at hand to crush and destroy a civilization which is hollow and decayed at the very core. Among other nations this is but "the survival of the fittest;" in the Israelites it is a horrible crime for the fittest to survive.

When God promised to give to Abraham the land of Canaan, he told him expressly that he could not enter immediately upon the possession of it. His children must go into Egypt and sojourn there for a time. But he said, "In the fourth generation they shall come hither again; for the iniquity of the Amorites is *not yet full.*" Gen. xv. 16.

So long as a trace of virtue remained among the inhabitants of Canaan, so long as there was any reason whatever for leniency, so long the mercy of God spared the Canaanites; and it was not until their iniquity was full, and justice and mercy alike demanded their extermination, that Israel was given possession of the land.

The eighteenth chapter of Leviticus contains prohibitions of various crimes of the grossest and basest character. In conclusion it is written, "Defile not ye yourselves in *any* of these things, for *in all these the nations were defiled* that *I cast out before you.* The land is defiled, and *therefore* do I visit the iniquities thereof upon it. The land itself *vomiteth out her inhabitants.* For *all these abominations* have the men of the land *done*, which were before you, and the land is defiled." And so the Israelites were solemnly charged not to commit any of these abominations, "that the land spue not *you* out *also*, when ye defile it, as it spued out the nations which were before you."

The nations of Canaan had forfeited their right to live. They were utterly debased and brutalized. Incest, bestiality, and every form of the grossest vice was prevalent among them. Individuals committing such crimes in any civilized community would forfeit life or liberty. What must have been the state of Canaanitish society, when the exceptional depths of horrible crime which startle civilization were but the *dead level* of their ordinary life? And these were not the crimes of individuals, but of *society* as a whole. There was no punishment for them; no law could reach them; the government itself was corrupt. Their very religion was corruption itself; their worship was lust and debauchery. All was one mass of reeking pollution. Only the judgments of God could purge the guilty land.

The iniquity of the Amorites had become full; and when Israel entered the land of Canaan a warfare began between two rival religions and civilizations, differing from each other as light differs from darkness, as God differs from Satan, as heaven differs from hell. It was a struggle between the solemn worship of the sanctuary of God, and the wild and bloody orgies of a licentious idolatry. It was a struggle between virtue and vice, chastity and debauchery, between ordererly family life and dissolute revelry, between reverent adoration of Almighty God, and the unclean revelings into which Satan had enticed the world. The two systems were at war, and were as irreconcilable as fire and water. Which should triumph in the struggle? On the answer to this question hung the destinies of the race. Victory for Midian and Baal signified universal pollution. Triumph for Israel meant the planting of an island of purity in an ocean of filth; a single mountain peak of decency in the midst of a deluge of debauchery. Even this solitary elevation was sometimes almost overwhelmed by the swelling billows of the

surrounding sea of sin. The cancer of vice must be cut out with the sword of war, or the race must rot and perish. The death of the few meant the salvation of the many. The preservation of Balaam, and Balak, and Midian, and Amalek, meant the pollution, the corruption, and damnation of the human race. The destruction of these vile and noxious weeds would give room for the vine of the Lord to be planted, the nation he had chosen, that through it all the nations of the earth should be blessed.

The people of Canaan well knew that God had given that land to the Israelites. Joshua ii. 9–11. Their true course was to submit or emigrate. They did neither. The deliverance of Israel from Egypt, and their victory over every opposing foe, was a sufficient intimation that it was useless to resist them. In fact some of the people *did* emigrate, and there appears to have been a tradition among the people in the western part of North Africa, that their ancestors were fugitives who were exiled from Palestine by "Joshua the son of Nun, the plunderer.*

But why, it may be asked, were the Israelites bidden to inflict these punishments? Why were not the Canaanites destroyed by special judgments of heaven, as were the antediluvians, the Cities of the Plain, or Pompeii and Herculaneum, which were overthrown in the midst of their debaucheries? The answer is this, these judgments had been tried. The antediluvians had been overwhelmed by the deluge, but the Sodomites still corrupted themselves. The Cities of the Plain were destroyed with fire from heaven in this very country, and yet the nations of Canaan did not profit by their example. We know how the ungodly and skeptical of to-day reject the idea of divine judgments, and do not for a moment admit that calamities are visited upon people in consequence of their iniquities. All are said to occur as the effects of natural

* See Rawlinson's *Historical Illustrations of the Old Testament*, chap. iv. p. 95.

causes; the Divine Being has no interest or connection with them. By the Canaanites, calamities of this kind would have been attributed to the anger of their own demoniac gods, and would have incited them to fresh idolatries. And hence in order to emphasize the fact that this was a divine judgment, the Israelites, as God's messengers, were bidden to complete the destruction, and they were distinctly told that if they imitated their predecessors in the abominations which had caused their overthrow, they themselves would find no exemption from a similar doom. A remarkable illustration of this is presented in

THE REBELLION OF THE TRIBE OF BENJAMIN.

This rebellion and its punishment are described in the closing chapters of the book of Judges. It was when there was no king in Israel, and the government was unsettled, and more or less disorderly. A certain Levite from Mount Ephraim, passing peaceably through the territory of Benjamin, stopped at Gibeah for the night with his wife. Here some demons, whom the historian calls "sons of Belial," abused the wife in such a way as to cause her death. The husband appealed for retribution to all the tribes of Israel. The chiefs of all the people presented themselves in the assembly of the people at Mizpeh,—four hundred thousand footmen. All the tribes of Israel excepting Benjamin were represented there. They carefully examined the facts of the case, and found that certain of the inhabitants of Gibeah had not only violated the rights of hospitality and humanity, and broken the peace, and committed a horrible crime, but they had also violated the rights of all the tribes to a safe passage through the whole country. No man in Israel could travel in safety if such outrages went unpunished. But no one of these tribes had jurisdiction in the case. Though they all were assembled, they could not proceed directly to

seize and punish the offenders. They therefore sent men "through all the tribe of Benjamin, saying, What wickedness is this that has been done among you?" and demanding that the guilty men should be delivered up to punishment. Had they done this, the whole matter would have been settled forthwith. The tribe of Benjamin would not obey the summons, but determined rather to dissolve their union with the other tribes, and accordingly gathered themselves together to go out to battle against the children of Israel.

This act, of course, changed the whole case. It was no longer the murder of an individual by a few sons of Belial in Gibeah, but it was a justification of their crime, and an open rebellion of the whole tribe of Benjamin. The authority of the nation, the constitution, and the Almighty were defied, and murderers whose lives would be forfeited in any decent country, were protected. Benjamin raised an army and levied war against all Israel, in defense of base and villanous scoundrels who deserved immediate execution for their atrocious crimes. The question now was whether the nation should live, or whether it should be broken up, and anarchy should prevail. The children of Israel inquired of the Lord, and the answer was that they should accept the issue forced upon them. They did so; but so stubborn were the children of Benjamin that the national forces were twice defeated; but the third time they returned to the battle Benjamin was routed, twenty-five thousand men were slain, the offending city was destroyed, the region around was desolated; and six hundred men, posted on an inaccessible rock, were all that remained of the tribe. This was evidently a most terrible infliction, and the sacred writer expressly declares that it was at a time when there was no king in Israel, and every man did that which was right in his own eyes. Still it can

hardly be denied that this proceeding, terrible as it was, was in the interests of order and righteousness. If Benjamin had been allowed to nullify the constitution of the nation and harbor murderers and outlaws; if citizens were allowed to commit the grossest crimes and be protected in their guilt, of course there was an end to the integrity of Israel as a nation. If one tribe were allowed to rebel and withdraw from the social compact, another might do the same; and the history of the nation would soon be a history of petty warfares and international strifes. The tribe of Benjamin must have been far gone in iniquity to have undertaken such a war for such a cause. Centrally situated as they were, had they been allowed to proceed in their course they would have wrecked the nation. Hence the highest patriotism demanded the overthrow of a rebellion which defied national authority and justified the most revolting crimes.

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE MIDIANITES.

One of the bitterest complaints made by infidels against the Bible has been stated in the following words:

"Our heavenly Father commanded the Hebrews to kill men and women, fathers, sons, and brothers, but to preserve the *girls* alive. Why were not the maidens also killed? Why were they spared? Read the thirty-first chapter of Numbers, and you will find that the maidens were given to the soldiers and to the priests. Is there, in all the history of war, a more infamous thing than this?"

The infidel's complaint seems to be that these maidens were not *killed.* Infidels have never forgiven Moses for sparing the lives of those young girls. They have rung the changes on this subject with a persistency which indicates their interest in the topic. If the Israelites had killed them all, as was not unusual in those days, they perhaps would have been better satisfied.

Let us look at the facts in this particular case. The people referred to were Midianites. Midian was not one of the seven nations which the Israelites were bidden to drive out from Canaan. They were not invaded by the Israelites, and Israel had no desire for their territory, but were simply passing through to their own inheritance in Canaan. While on their march toward Canaan "Israel sent messengers unto Sihon, king of the Amorites, saying, Let me pass through thy land; we will not turn into the fields or into the vineyards; we will not drink of the waters of the well, but we will go along by the king's highway until we be past thy borders. And Sihon *would not suffer Israel to pass through his border;* but Sihon gathered all his people together, and went out against Israel into the wilderness : and he came to Jahaz and fought against Israel, and Israel smote him with the edge of the sword, and possessed his land from Arnon unto Jabbok, even unto the children of Ammon; for the border of the children of Ammon was strong." Num. xxi. Thus Sihon, king of the Amorites, refused to allow the Israelites who were *fleeing from slavery* the poor privilege of passing quietly through his land; but instead of this made war upon them, and was destroyed, and his land was given to the Israelites.

They then turned and went up by the way of Bashan. "And Og, the king of Bashan, *went out against them*, he and all his people, to the battle at Edrei." Num. xxi. 33. The Lord delivered Og into the hands of Israel, and his people were destroyed, and Israel possessed the land. Still marching forward, they reached the plains of Moab, and Balak, the king of Moab, consulted with the elders of Midian, and sent the elders of Moab and the elders of Midian as messengers to hire Balaam to curse Israel, saying, "Peradventure I shall prevail, that we may smite them and drive them out of the land." Num. xxii. 6.

Balaam coveted the wages of unrighteousness, and came to curse Israel; but God turned the curse into a blessing, and he prophesied of Israel's greatness, and solemnly told Balak that there was no enchantment or divination that could prevail against that nation.

Having thus failed to procure a curse upon Israel, and so defeat them in battle, Balak wished to contrive some other way to effect their ruin; and Balaam craftily proposed that the Midianites should send their wives and their daughters to seduce the Israelites to participate in the idolatrous debaucheries attendant on the worship of Baal-Peor. This Satanic plan proved effectual. "Israel abode in Shittim, and the people began to commit whoredom with the daughters of Moab. And they called the people unto the sacrifice of their gods, and the people did eat and bowed down to their gods. And Israel joined himself unto Baal-Peor. And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel."

The very life of the nation was in danger. When we remember that centuries later there were in polished Corinth not less than a thousand prostitutes connected with a single temple of Venus; when we remember that every woman dwelling in Babylon was required once in her life to prostitute herself to strangers in the precincts of Venus's temple, we can imagine what must have been the religious rites in which the Moabites, the incestuous descendants of Lot, engaged. And in addition to these abominations we are told in later times that the apostate Israelites "built also the high places of Baal, to *burn their sons with fire for burnt offerings unto Baal.*" Jer. xix. 5.

This was the kind of god and this the style of worship into which the Israelites had been beguiled. The women, and even the daughters of the princes, lent themselves to seduce and debase the children of Israel, defiling even the camp of Israel with their abominations, that they might

bring upon the chosen people the curse of God, and so accomplish their destruction. As a result of this, disease entered the camp, and twenty-four thousand of the people of Israel died, and a multitude of the Israelites who had been involved in these abominations were slain by the command of God.

It was after all this had transpired that "the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Vex the Midianites, and smite them; for they vex you with their wiles, wherewith they have beguiled you in the matter of Peor, and in the matter of Cozbi, the daughter of the prince of Midian, their sister, which was slain in the day of the plague for Peor's sake." Num. xxv. 16-18. Accordingly, twelve thousand men were sent forth by Moses to execute vengeance upon the Midianites. They warred against them; and when Israel went to war, it was with the expectation that somebody would get hurt. When they had conquered the Midianites, they slew all the males that had opposed them. They were not the first nor the last army that went forth determined to take no prisoners of the men found in arms against them. Men who kept away from war escaped the sword; but those who fought must abide the issue of the battle. They slew the five kings of Midian, and Balaam the son of Beor also received the reward of his iniquity, perishing at their hands. With customary humanity, under the general law of the Jewish nation in the time of war, they took all the women and maidens, with all the little ones, as captives. Men in arms forfeited their lives. The women and little ones were taken captive and dispersed among the people, and probably better treated than they ever had been at home; and finally became incorporated into the Jewish nation. "So the children of Israel took all the women and maidens captive, and their little ones, and took a spoil of all their cattle and all their flocks, and all their goods." In this

particular case, when the captives were brought in, special reasons caused a departure from their usual custom.

Moses said, "Have ye saved all the *women* alive? Behold, these caused the children of Israel, through the counsel of Balaam, to commit trespass against the Lord in the matter of Peor; and there was a plague among the congregation of the Lord." These women whom they had spared were *the very persons* who were sent by their husbands and brothers to seduce Israel, and were instigators of the sin into which Israel had fallen,—the guilty cause of the curse and calamity which came upon them. These women of Midian were simply a horde of prostitutes, who had done their worst to scatter disease and death through the camp of Israel, coolly, deliberately, and purposely, by the direction of their rulers, and with the approval of their husbands and fathers. Unfit to live, a disgrace and curse to the community, persons whose very presence signified corruption and debauchery, disease and death; who had probably caused the death of more than their own number of the Israelites, and who, if allowed to live among them, would have utterly ruined the nation through the pollutions and diseases that followed their iniquitous course,—these were the persons who, in the interest of home and family life; in the interest of decency and morality; in the interest of generations to come, whose very existence was imperiled by their presence, were, by the command of Moses, exterminated and swept from the land as by the besom of destruction. Doubtless many of the skeptics of the day would gladly have spared them. They have never forgiven Moses for blotting out a people in whose principles and conduct they find so much to approve, admire, and imitate.

When these idolatrous prostitutes were exterminated, there were left two classes. First, the male children, who, if left to themselves, would perish with want and

neglect. It will hardly be claimed that the Israelites, a company of fugitives "red from the lash, and recent from the chain," were under obligation to preserve, protect, defend, and *support* those children, who, growing up with all their hereditary proclivities to evil, could only be expected to develop into intractable, vicious, and licentious men, who at best would be a constant curse and danger to the commonwealth, and might in mature life undertake to avenge their parents' death. Accordingly they shared the doom of their parents. Infidels might have left them to starve to death on the sands, as a special illustration of their mercifulness.

There remained only the *young girls*, between infancy and youth, who as yet had not been corrupted and polluted by the vices and idolatries of the nation. They were preserved *alive*. Infidels intimate, doubtless judging the Israelites by themselves, that they were preserved for the basest of purposes. Had this been the object, persons of ordinary perception can see that the ones destroyed would have been the ones preserved, while those preserved would have been held of less account.

These female children were preserved as *servants*, and as such came under the provisions of the Jewish law. Had they been persons of mature age, they would still have been hedged about by that protective law. No Israelitish warrior was permitted to offer a captive woman either insult or outrage.

This was the law: "When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and the Lord thy God hath delivered them into thine hands and thou hast taken them captive, and seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldst have her *to be thy wife;* then thou shalt bring her home to thine house; and she shall shave her head and pare her nails; and she shall put the raiment of her captivity from off

her, and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and mother a *full month;* and after that thou shalt go in unto her, and be her husband, and *she shall be thy wife.*" Deut. xxi. 10–14. From this it appears that no Israelite was allowed even to take a captive as a *wife*, until after an interval of at least a month from the time she was taken captive and brought to his house. After the month had expired, if his inclinations had not changed upon seeing her shaven, and deprived of her attractions, and if she had exhibited no traits of character which inspired dislike, he was at liberty to marry her; but she was not his *slave*, nor under his absolute control. He was to be her husband, and she was to be his wife; and even then, if the union was irksome and distasteful to her, her remedy was in her own hands; for if she so conducted herself that he had no delight in her, he was to let her go whither she would. He was not allowed to sell her for money, but she was to have her liberty absolutely.

This was the fate of those Midianitish maidens and children. Their fathers had fought against Israel, and all the males had been destroyed. Their mothers and sisters had seduced Israel to sin, and had been justly punished with death. These innocent girls were preserved, and scattered among the virtuous families of the Israelites, trained to the knowledge of God and truth and duty, made servants, under the mild protective rules of servitude prescribed by the Mosaic law, and finally married into the families of the Israelites, and incorporated into the Jewish nation. Infidels have never forgiven the act. It has been to them a perpetual occasion of scoffing, mocking and complaining. If Israel had slaughtered the whole of the Midianites, as was anciently customary, we should have heard less complaint. If they had preserved *all* the women, for the only purpose for which infidels seem to

think they were worth preserving, and had brought in twenty or thirty thousand Midianitish prostitutes into the Jewish nation, to corrupt and destroy it, infidels would have found no fault with *that*. Or if they had allowed those girls to grow up to the lives of debauchery and prostitution which inevitably awaited them in their own nation, we should have heard no complaint from infidels on that score. But the fact that they were preserved from death, virtuously trained, and respectably married, is a crime which the infidelity of modern times has never been able to forgive or forget.

By this arrangement thirty-two thousand Midianitish female children were incorporated into the nation. Perhaps as many adult women who had been corrupted by heathenish vices were destroyed. It was a terrible vengeance, and none but God could have presumed to command it. But what would have been the condition of a community situated as the Israelites were, in the wilderness, away from settled government and police regulations, destitute of prisons and appliances for the enforcement of social order, had there been launched upon them, or incorporated with them, thirty thousand infamous women, gathered from the ranks of the debased and idolatrous Midianites; persons whose very worship was debauchery, and who would have brought with them all the diseases and pollutions which such a course of life entails? The corruption would have inevitably spread, the curse of God would have fallen upon Israel, and that nation which was the world's last hope, the only nation where purity was enjoined and idolatry was prohibited, would have gone down into the same abyss which had engulfed the heathen world. The sword of wrath cut out this Midianitish cancer. Their armies were slain, and their women reaped the vengeance they had courted when they sought to seduce Israel and planned their destruction.

We are not, however, to suppose that the entire nation was destroyed. They were a wandering race, and were scattered over a wide extent of country. Only twelve thousand Israelites went to battle. They slew those who resisted, and the others were spared. Long years after, we find Midian's hosts invading the land of Israel, as grasshoppers for multitude, "the sword of the Lord and of Gideon" being unsheathed to repel them. Judg. vi. vii.

The punishments inflicted on the Midianites, the Canaanites, and all those besotted nations which warred against Israel, though severe, were demanded by the necessities of the case, and were conducive to the public good. Had the corrupt nations of Canaan been subjugated, enslaved, and preserved, they would have inevitably demoralized their conquerors, who, in their idle leisure, could not have escaped contamination, if surrounded by a people so utterly corrupt as the Canaanites. Had the destruction of these nations resulted wholly from natural causes, by slow decay or from sudden calamities, the hand of God would not have been recognized in the punishment, and men would not have learned his hatred of sin and impurity. Hence, that the moral lesson might not be lost upon both Israel and the surrounding nations, such measures were taken as would leave no uncertainty concerning the matter. First, God sent hornets before Israel, "to drive out the Hivites, the Canaanites, and the Hittites;"* much as a terrible disease swept away the Indians of eastern Massachusetts, just before the Pilgrim Fathers settled on those shores. Second, a series of miracles, commencing in Egypt, marked the career of the Israelites until they finally were established in the land of Canaan. All the elements seemed in league with them; the Red Sea opened; they found sustenance in the desert; the waters of Jordan divided; the ramparts of Jericho fell;

* Exod. xxiii. 28. Deut. vii. 20. Josh. xxiv. 12.

the stars in their courses fought against the enemies of God; and finally the work of destruction was completed by the Israelites themselves, who were instructed to execute punishment upon the Midianites and Canaanites, that they might teach the nations how God abhorred impurity, and also thus learn for themselves a lesson of obedience to the divine counsels, and of abstinence from the sins which they were bidden to punish in others.*

Severe as were the judgments inflicted in the Mosaic dispensation upon those who transgressed the laws of purity, and thus sapped the foundations of individual and national existence, yet the Mosaic law as a rule inclined to mercy, and provided important safeguards to protect those accused of wrong-doing, and thus secure to every one a fair trial and a legal acquittal, or a just punishment. One of these provisions was the establishment of

THE CITIES OF REFUGE.

The six Cities of Refuge, three of which were located on each side of the Jordan, illustrate the merciful character of Moses' law. The customs of that country, then as now, imperatively required the nearest living relative of a man who had been killed, to avenge his death. No time was allowed for investigation, trial, or defense. Hence a man guilty of manslaughter or accidental homicide was liable to receive the same penalty that was inflicted upon a deliberate murderer. The law of Moses required that whenever a man had slain his fellow, he should at once flee for his life to the nearest City of Refuge, which was easy of access.

Broad, straight roads led to those cities; and they were inhabited by priests and Levites, who were familiar with the law of Moses, and whose business it was to protect the

* For additional facts and arguments concerning the destruction of the nations of Canaan, consult *The Great Controversy between God and Man*, by H. L. HASTINGS. pp. 45-52.

refugee from private vengeance or mob violence, until he could have a fair trial. If it was proven that he was guilty of deliberate murder, he was then delivered over to death; but if he was not proven guilty of murder, he was exempt from death, but was to remain within the walls of the City of Refuge until the death of the Jewish high priest, after which he was at liberty to go his way in security.

While this law did not prohibit the avenging of blood by private hands, in accordance with all the customs and traditions of the times, it so modified the usage as to secure to every man a fair and impartial trial, substantial justice, and protection from undeserved punishment.

DID THE LAW OF MOSES SANCTION SLAVERY?

Infidels bitterly complain that the law of Moses ordained and sanctioned slavery; asserting that no such law could be of divine origin. This charge is another instance of the unfairness of skeptical statements concerning simple facts within the reach of all; and it also illustrates the ignorance of infidels concerning the plain teachings of the Holy Scriptures. Neither *slaves* nor *slavery* are mentioned in the books of Moses. We know but two passages where the word *slave* occurs in the Bible. Jer. ii. 14, and Rev. xviii. 13. And in Jeremiah ii. 14, the word *slave* is a supplied word, not found in the original. The Hebrew word *eved* which is translated *servant* nearly 700 times, is *never* rendered *slave*. It is applied to David, Abraham, Jacob, Moses, Job, Elijah, Isaiah, Ben-hadad, the king of Babylon, Zerubbabel, and in several instances to the Messiah himself. A strange word to describe what *we* call slavery!

In fact, we see that *slavery* was not mentioned in the Hebrew Scriptures, and was impracticable on any extended scale, under the Jewish system. The children of Israel

had no vast estates. They were not allowed to join field to field. They could neither buy nor sell lands; they could only lease them until the year of jubilee. Even King Ahab could only obtain the inheritance of a neighbor for a garden by murdering the owner and confiscating his property. The Israelites had no extensive manufactories or mines; no cotton fields, rice swamps, or sugar plantations. They lived simply, and supported themselves on their little plots of ground. And as whoever had servants was bound to support them and their families, the establishment of *slavery* on any extended scale was utterly impracticable in the land of Israel. What could an Israelite have done on his little twenty-acre farm, with the *ten thousand slaves* of an ancient Roman?

It is true that Abraham had a large number of servants, but they were no more slaves than the members of a tribe or clan are slaves. He was head or sheik of his tribe, and they were his followers. He lived a wandering life, with his flocks and herds, and was surrounded by a throng of dependants. But this was long before the law was given by Moses; and under that law even this arrangement was impracticable.

SLAVERY IN GREECE AND ROME.

Human slavery was a well-known, ancient, and almost universal institution. Before Christianity had subdued the passions and ameliorated the animosities of men and nations, every nation looked upon every other nation as their natural enemies, and treated them accordingly; imprisoning, enslaving, or killing them if found on their territory. When wars broke out, the cry was, "Woe to the vanquished;" and men were slaughtered without mercy, or if spared were condemned to bitter bondage, and employed by the conquerors in the most laborious and degrading occupations, till they sunk beneath the toil.

The erection of the Roman Coliseum is said to have been the work of *twelve thousand captive Jews.* The Grecian states countenanced piracy as a public benefit, because of the large number of captives they were thus enabled to enslave. In Greece slaves were lashed, mutilated, tortured, branded and slain, without justice or mercy. In Attica, a state smaller than Rhode Island, at one time there were estimated to be of citizens and aliens 124,000 or less, and 400,000 slaves. Gibbon reckons the population of the Roman empire under Claudius at one hundred and twenty millions, *half of whom were slaves.* Mommsen places the population of Rome at 1,610,000, of whom 900,000, or more than half, were slaves. Aristotle tells us that the island of Ægina, containing forty-two square miles, with outlying dependencies, had 470,000 slaves. Corinth had 460,000 slaves; and Delos, an opulent seat of trade, could in a single day receive and send away 10,000 slaves.

In Greece, personal beauty in a slave was punishable with death. Every slave received annually a certain number of lashes to remind him that he was a slave. No master could free a slave even if he desired to. Slaves were *compelled* to drink themselves drunk, and thus exhibit to the Spartans an example of what intoxication was. Under the laws of Lycurgus, every year the boldest and brightest Grecian youth were fed high to make them ferocious, armed with daggers, and equipped with several days' provisions, and sent on an expedition to the fields, where they were to hide by day, and sally out at night and butcher all the slaves they met.

Among the captured slaves of those times were mechanics, poets, linguists, and men of every grade and class. Crassus owned more than five hundred architects and masons. Plato himself, offending Dionysius, the tyrant of Sicily, by his plain speaking, was handed over to the

Spartan embassador, Pollis, and exposed for sale in the slave market in Ægina, and only escaped by being redeemed by a friend. Human life was cheap then. In the time of Demosthenes a good slave cost about thirty dollars, or half the price of a good horse. In Rome, just before the birth of Christ, a slave was worth ninety dollars; but after battles had been fought, captives could be purchased for a trifle. In the camp of Lucullus in Pontus, men could be bought for *less than eighty cents.*

Thus according to the laws and customs of the mightiest and most polished nations of antiquity, *any man* could be kidnapped, captured, and sold into bondage, being absolutely under his master's power; his servitude being perpetual, and descending to his children. Under the Roman law a man could kill his slave as he would kill a dog. One Roman nobleman used to cut up such of his slaves as broke dishes, and feed them to the lampreys in his pond. The slave had no protection whatever against his master's avarice, anger, or lust. He was viewed as an inferior animal, and might be scourged, tortured, mutilated or killed at pleasure. Marriage was unknown among slaves. The master could break up their families, and permanently separate them at will. He could force women to become prostitutes, and degrade men to still baser uses. He could compel them to become gladiators, and train them to fight with each other or with wild beasts, until they were killed. He could turn them out in sickness or old age, abandoning them to starvation. If the master was killed in his house, all the slaves could be put to death. Tacitus (*Annals*, xii. 42) tells us of a slave who in his rage killed his master, who had promised him freedom and had broken his word. The case was discussed in the senate. Cassius, the Stoic, defended the law, and *six hundred slaves, all innocent*, were murdered by order of the Roman senate. This was *slavery*,

an institution as foreign to the Israelitish policy as candor is to the character of some who assail the law of Moses as an instrument of bondage and oppression.

THE PUNISHMENT FOR MANSTEALING.

Slavery had its foundation in violence and kidnapping; but the law of Moses said, "He that *stealeth* a man and *selleth* him, or if he be *found in his hand*, he shall surely be put to death." Exod xxi. 16. The law of Moses made the *stealing* of a man, *selling* him, or *holding* the man thus stolen in bondage, a capital crime. Again it is said, "If a man be found stealing any of his *brethren* of the children of Israel, and *maketh merchandise of him*, or *selleth* him, then *that thief shall die;* and thou shalt put evil away from among you." Deut. xxiv. 7. Under the law of Moses no theft of *property* was punishable with death. Such crimes were punished by enforcing restitution, in some cases twofold, in others four or fivefold; and in cases of poverty, by compelling the thief to work as a bondman, and repay the value of the things stolen. Exod. xxii. 3, 9, 12. But when a *man* was stolen, the penalty was *death;* and the stealing or *selling* of a man was thus punishable, and no mercy was allowed.

Hence slavery, properly so called, was unknown, and the word *slave* does not occur in the writings of Moses. In some cases *bondmen* and *bondmaids* were purchased of the heathen round about, and of the children of strangers, and these were brought unto a condition of permanent servitude. Lev. xxv. 44, 45. But these persons were already enslaved and degraded, and the change must have been most welcome to them. And there is a question whether this servitude extended beyond the year of jubilee. These servants were to be circumcised, and participate in the passover feast (Exod. vii. 44), and in other religious festivities. Deut. xii. 12–18; xvi. 21–24.

They enjoyed the weekly *rest days*, which were binding upon all who dwelt in the land. We find only two instances of bondmen running away from their masters mentioned in the Old Testament. 2 Sam. xxv. 20; 2 Kings ii. 39. The wise servant had rule over the son which caused shame, and had part of the inheritance among the brethren (Prov. xvii. 2); and sometimes the servant married the daughter of the master. 2 Chron. ii. 35.

The Jews, it is true, were sometimes compelled to engage in wars. They were assailed, and must defend themselves; and sometimes they were made the instruments of chastisement to the corrupt and besotted nations around them. In time of war, they, like other nations, took captives. What should be done with them? They did not wish to slaughter or mutilate them, as most of the neighboring nations did: if they set them free they would only return to swell the ranks of their enemies, and perhaps join in another invasion of their land. Hence, the only practicable way was to place them under restraint as bondmen. Their condition, however, was in a vast majority of instances better than in their own land. Captive women were protected from insult and outrage. If servants became dissatisfied with their masters and ran away, no Israelite was allowed to return them. The law said: "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee. He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him." Deut. xxiii. 15, 16. This was the "Fugitive Slave Law" in the time of Moses. Have moderns greatly improved upon it?

There were also servants "born in the house;" probably the children of captives taken in war. These were members of the family, and sometimes had charge of the

affairs of the household, as in the case of Abraham's steward, Eliezer of Damascus (Gen. xxv. 13); and at other times they were regarded as sons, or united by marriage to the children and heirs of the household.

We also read in the Scriptures of servants *bought with money;* but since the *selling* of their brethren was punishable with *death*, how could slaves be bought with money? They must have been persons bought out of *foreign slavery*, or else persons who, being reduced to poverty, *sold themselves*. Thus it is written, "Ye have *sold yourselves* for nought." Isa. lii. 3. In Leviticus (xxv. 39–47) we read, "If thy brother be waxen poor with thee, and *sell himself* unto thee, thou shalt not make him to serve as a bond-servant. If a sojourner or stranger wax rich by thee, and thy brother that dwelleth by him wax poor and *sell himself* unto the stranger or sojourner by thee, . . . after that he is sold he may be redeemed again." Thus servants were *bought with money*, that is, hired for a certain period or term of years. A man might mortgage his property, and might be still unable to support his family. He might then *sell himself* as a servant; but *no one else* could sell him. He was not a beast, to be maltreated and slain; nor was he a chattel, to be sold, bartered, or passed from hand to hand. He was a man, and had his rights. He owed service to *one man*, who could not transfer his claim to any one else. He could not be sent out of the country. He might be called for and redeemed at any time, by any friend, by the payment of a price, fixed, not by the caprice of his master, but by computation of the amount paid for him, and the length of his term of service yet unexpired. At the close of the sixth year his servitude expired by limitation, or on the jubilee year, if that occurred before the sixth year closed.

Such a man was not a *slave*. He was a bondman, like many a lad who has been "bound out" till he was of age;

or like emigrants, bound to work till their passage-money was repaid; but such bondage was in no sense slavery.

Another cause of servitude was, if a man committed a theft he was to restore fourfold or fivefold; and if he *had nothing*, then he was to be sold for his theft. Ex. xxii. 3. He must work out the amount which the law required him to pay. But he could not be sold to a foreigner or carried abroad. (Josephus, *Antiquities*, b. xvi. c. 1, § 1.) He must be where he could be delivered up if called for, or redeemed.

A man might also sell his daughter as a maid-servant with the understanding that she was to be betrothed to the purchaser or to his son; but if he took another wife, and did not fulfill all his obligations to her, she was at once to *go free*.

The father's power to dispose of a daughter was not like the power of the ancient Romans, where parents had the right to put their children to death at pleasure; and the fact that the father *sold* his daughter did not make her the *property* of the buyer. Boaz *bought* Ruth. Ruth iv. 10. Jacob *bought* his wives with years of labor. Gen. xxix. 16-23. And the purchase of wives was the general practice in those times. Ex. xxii. 17; 1 Sam. xviii. 25. But such purchases did not involve the idea of slavery or of mere proprietary right. It was the marriage custom of those times.

THE PROTECTION OF SERVANTS FROM ABUSE.

If a man smote his servant with a *rod*—not with a stone or a weapon, but simply with an instrument of correction —if he killed him, he was to be punished. If death did not occur immediately, it was then adjudged that the injury might have been unintentional, or accidental, or might have resulted from other causes; and that loss of the bondman's services was a sufficient punishment to the

master for the chastisement he had inflicted on his servant. The master was not exempted from punishment because the injured person was his servant, or his *money*, for if he died under his hand he was to be punished for his death, servant though he was; but in case of his lingering along, an element of doubt entered into the case, and the accused had the benefit of the doubt. It was presumed that a man would not intentionally deprive himself of the money he had paid to secure the services of a bondman for a term of years; and every Israelite knew that any serious injury which he might inflict on a servant released him from all obligations of further service.

The servant who was maimed or injured under the correction of his master, thereby became entitled to his freedom. If in chastising a servant the master knocked out a tooth or destroyed an eye, the servant was entitled to liberty as a compensation for the injury done. Ex. xxi. 26, 27. The natural tendency of such a law as this was to prevent harsh treatment by masters, and to make it for their own interest to treat their servants with the utmost gentleness.

The servitude of any Israelite might be terminated at any time by satisfying the claims against him. When the balance of the debt due was paid, the man was liberated or redeemed. When the thief had worked out his time, he was free; or the year of jubilee might occur within the time, as then the law gave all servants liberty. Lev. xxv. 40. Or at the expiration of six years from the commencement of his servitude the servant went free. Ex. xxi. 2; Deut. xv. 12. The death of the master without leaving a male heir was held by the Rabbins to liberate the servants. And at the termination of his servitude the master was not allowed to let the servant go away empty, but to liberally reward him out of his field, and his threshing-floor, and his

wine-press. Deut. xv. 13, 14. This provision of a reward, the amount of which was left discretionary with the master, would stimulate the bondman to faithful service, that he might at the expiration of his term have something to start in the world anew.

If a servant, contented with his lot, refused to go away, then he was to go before judges, and there by a formal ceremony (Ex. xxi. 6; Deut. xv. 17) bind himself as a permanent servant. He was then to remain in the house forever,—though some of the Jews assert that this bond only extended to the year of jubilee, the fiftieth year. But whatever his condition he never became a chattel or a thing. While ancient slavery denied to its subjects the rights of *manhood*, under the law of Moses the servant was a bond*man* and possessed the rights and privileges of a human being.

THE WIVES OF SERVANTS.

Great objection has been made to the provision that if a master gave a wife to a servant, when his time of servitude expired the wife and children were to remain the property of the master. To understand this provision, we must note that the female servants thus spoken of were doubtless persons who had been taken captive in war, or their children who had been brought up in the family of the master. Thus he had certain claims upon them. It was the custom of those days for men to *purchase* their wives with money or labor, and of course the servant having rendered no such service, could not be entitled to claim or remove the wife which he had taken in the house of his master, without making such compensation for services as immemorial custom required. Of course he was well aware of this when he contracted such a marriage. He, moreover, had the right to remain in the house with his wife and family; and if he departed,

it does not appear that she ceased to be his wife. She could not be sold to another. She was provided for in his absence or in his presence, not being dependent on him for support; and if he went away he knew where to find her when he returned, unless she had been set free. Families could not there be separated or torn asunder. But while he was free to go as he pleased, she was regarded as owing service to that household until such time as their claims should be canceled. The mere fact of her marriage to a fellow-servant did not liberate her from the obligations she was under to her master's family.

A captive woman who had been taken as a wife by an Israelite could not again be reduced to servitude. If she was discarded, she must be set free. A servant might be elevated to the position of a wife, but a wife could not be degraded to the position of a servant.

Such, in brief, are some of the provisions of the Jewish law concerning servitude. As it regards *slavery*, it was unknown in the land of Israel, though well known among outside nations, both in ancient and modern times. And the charges that infidels make against the law of Moses as countenancing *slavery*, clearly indicate that ignorance of the Scriptures which is so characteristic of skeptics as a class, or that indifference to accuracy of statement concerning matters of fact which seems to be an indispensable qualification for skeptical teachers.

A PRACTICABLE LAW.

One noteworthy feature of the Mosaic law was its practicability. The wise legislator considers that he is not making laws for an ideal society. If men were all righteous and would always do right, laws would be needless. Laws are made because, through ignorance and perversity, people will do wrong and will go astray. But laws, to be useful in a community, must be of such a

nature that they can be enforced. When the people of Athens, through factions and intestine broils, were on the brink of ruin, they appealed to Draco to frame a new code of laws for them. His laws were chiefly remarkable for the rigor of their penalties. Every violation of them was punishable with death; a severity which rendered them incapable of execution; as when under English laws capital crimes were numbered by hundreds, it was impossible to enforce them. Witnesses would not testify, jurors would not convict, and though in the four years from 1828 to 1832 there were 3786 convictions, there were only 66 executions.

Laws which cannot be executed are worse than useless. After the failure of Draco's laws, Solon was summoned to take the helm and save the sinking ship of state. He introduced a constitution which he said "was not the best in itself, but the best that the Athenians would bear." Rousseau, the skeptic, in his treatise on the *Social Compact* (b. ii. c. 8–11) says, "The prudent legislator does not begin by making a digest of salutary laws; but examines first whether the people for whom such laws are designed are capable of supporting them. It was for this reason that Plato refused to give laws to the Arcadians and Cyrenians, knowing that they were rich and luxurious, and could not admit of the introduction of equality among them. When customs are once established, and prejudices have taken root among the people, it is a dangerous and fruitless enterprise to attempt to reform them. Legislation should be variously modified in different countries. . . . Every people should have a particular system of law, *not always the best in itself*, but the best adapted for the state for which it is calculated." "The secret of great statesmanship," says Niebuhr, "is a gradual development and improvement of the several parts to an equal constitution." Wise legislators never

attempt to raise a constitution at once to perfection. Nations are for the most part very tenacious of their customs, and very apt to rebel against violent innovations. Wise statesmen, therefore, says Montesquieu, do not change them suddenly, but let the people make the changes themselves. No really wise legislator will make laws which shock the general sense of a nation.

Many regulations which might be exceedingly desirable, even in civilized communities, are impracticable because they cannot be enforced. Entire abstinence from all intoxicating beverages would be desirable; but a law requiring this would probably be useless, because it could not be executed. Hence moral means must largely be depended on to restrain and reform mankind. Law does not mark the *highest level* desired in human conduct. It simply marks the *lowest level* which will be *tolerated* by the community or the lawgiver. Though the law does not forbid a man to become intoxicated, yet in the interest of public order and morality it forbids *public* intoxication. This does not imply any approval or permission of private intoxication; but simply that the law does not undertake the impossible task of regulating the private acts of individuals which do not conflict with public order. Many evils are dealt with in the same manner, and wise legislators often seek to restrain and regulate wrongs which they cannot at once remove.

POLYGAMY AND DIVORCE.

An example of this is found in the Mosaic law regulating polygamy. The Mosaic law did not ordain, command, or commend the practice. It confined itself to regulating an old, established, and widely extended institution. To have attempted to uproot it would have seriously disturbed the existing social order. It would have broken up families, cast off wives, disinherited children,

and might have been attended with great dangers and serious evils. Hence, instead of cutting down the tree, the Mosaic law girdled it.

First, the kings of Israel were forbidden to multiply wives unto themselves.* The course of David and Solomon in this respect, though in accord with Eastern usage, was in direct opposition to the law under which they held the throne. Besides, no person was permitted to take a second wife to the *neglect* or exclusion of the first.† A man was not allowed to take wife after wife, neglecting the first because he had found another younger and fairer. The full rights and privileges of the wife first taken were solemnly guaranteed to her in every particular. The tendency of this provision was evidently to restrain and discourage such unions, and so far as possible to limit the evil of polygamy. It was only under the pressure of the most terrible calamities, when the men of Judah were slain by the sword, and the gates of Jerusalem were desolate, that seven women were to seek alliance with one man, to remove the reproach attached to celibacy. Isa. iii. 25; iv. 1. The Law of Moses not only provided every man a farm, but its provisions, which tended to increase the *male* population, as a rule provided for every woman a husband, thus honoring marriage and restraining vice and immorality.

Another example is found in the Mosaic provision for divorce. The Saviour distinctly says that Moses on account of the hardness of their hearts suffered them to put away their wives, but from the beginning it was not so. The law was not in accordance with the highest principles, nor was it a regulation of an ideal society. It was simply on account of the hardness of their hearts. The law was graded on the lines of possibility and practicability. The question was not what would be a perfect

* Deut. xvii. 17.

† Exodus xxi. 10.

law for a perfect people; for in a state of absolute perfection no law would be needed. The question was not what was the best law that could be made for angels and saints in heaven, or for Adam and Eve in paradise; but what was the best law that could be imposed upon a nation of sinners, fresh from the bondage of Egypt, in the desert of Sinai and in the land of Canaan. In the beginning God created one man and one woman. This was the primary and perfect order. But it was an order which it might have been impossible to revive at the time when the Mosaic law was given.

There have been countries in Christendom which utterly prohibit divorce. But it is by no means certain that their laws operate to secure the well being and morality of the people; and it is reasonably sure that such a law in the time of Moses would have failed to accomplish the end desired. Indeed, it has been found in modern times that after the enlightenment of successive generations it is by no means easy to eradicate an evil like polygamy, with all the machinery of law and government, armies and navies at hand,—to say nothing of schools, missions, and educational appliances.

The fact that the law given by Moses was a *practicable* law, not attempting impossibilities, but confining its enactments within the bounds where its authority could be exercised, is another instance of the divine wisdom embodied in that law.

THE POSITION OF WOMEN AMONG THE HEBREWS.

It is well known that under ordinary circumstances, about one hundred and five male children are born to every one hundred female children. This excess of births seems intended to compensate for the greater number of deaths which occur among the males in consequence of the special dangers to which they are exposed. The

number of deaths among males is unquestionably increased by the use of intoxicants and narcotics, and various other excesses, which increase may be balanced in civilized communities by the greater mortality of women induced by unhealthful ways of living, dress, and occupation. But the disposition of men to incur risks, travel, explore, and colonize, still leaves a deficiency of men in old and long-settled communities. In Great Britain there are over nine hundred thousand more women than men; and the world has been horrified by accounts of a hellish traffic in female innocence there carried on, which could not be expected to occur were the sexes more evenly balanced. In the State of Massachusetts there are sixty-two thousand more women than men, and in the city of Boston women number seventeen thousand more than men. The presence of such an excess of female population is not only an occasion of great inconvenience and suffering among the helpless, but is also fraught with positive danger to the morals and well-being of the community.

It is a curious fact that under the operation of certain of the Mosaic interdictions yet to be mentioned, which infidels scoff at because they cannot comprehend their utility, the proportion of the average birth-rate is materially changed; so that instead of the one hundred and *five* males born to every one hundred females among the Gentiles, there are among the Jews *one hundred and twelve* males born to every one hundred females. This peculiarity of birth-rate, of course, affords to the Jews great advantage in point of national strength and increase.

It has often been remarked that the Jewish religion was much more readily embraced by women than by men. The painful initiatory rite stood directly in the way of every male proselyte to Judaism. On the other hand, the positive advantages offered women under the Jewish

law were such as must have been highly esteemed. The position of women in the heathen world was, and ever has been, a position of the most abject degradation imaginable. To-day, India has within her borders 124,000,000 women, "unwelcome at their birth, accursed as widows, unlamented when they die; and this with all 'the light of Asia' surrounding them."

The position of women among the Jews was far different. As a maiden, she was protected and defended by Jewish law, and he who betrayed her was obliged to marry her, if she consented, and without the possibility of a future divorce. The rights of the Jewish wife were carefully guarded. Her husband was not allowed to go to war for a year after they were married; and though the eastern institution of polygamy was not utterly prohibited, yet it was so restricted that it must not in any way invade the rights and privileges of the wife. If a husband became jealous of his wife's fidelity, the legal presumptions were all in her favor. The husband was not allowed to inflict summary punishment; but she was subjected to an ordeal which could by no possibility work injury to her, unless through the guilt of her own conscience or the interposition of divine providence. Num. v. As a mother, the Jewish woman must be honored by her children. As a daughter, the Jewish woman had rights and an inheritance. If the wife or daughter uttered rash and foolish vows, the husband or father had a right to disannul them, provided he did it from the day it came to his knowledge. Even the Gentile woman taken captive by a young Israelitish warrior must have been surprised to receive treatment so strangely different from that received by captives in her own country, or even among modern nations who profess to be civilized. Her captor could not offer her an insult; she must be taken, not to a prison, but to his home, where she must neither be abused nor

outraged, but treated with patient consideration; and she could not be taken, even as a wife, until a full month had elapsed, during which he might secure her affections or reconsider his determination. And if after her marriage she was discontented and made herself disagreeable, she could never again be held as a servant, but must be allowed to go free. Widows, who in heathen lands have been degraded and sometimes murdered or burned, were to be treated with the utmost tenderness. They shared in the tithes, and were admitted to the public festivities. They had a right to glean in the fields and gather up the forgotten sheaves, to gather which the owner was not allowed to go back. Injustice against widows was treated with fearful punishment. "Thou shalt not take the widow's raiment to pledge" (Deut. xxiv. 17), was a benevolent law which cannot be paralleled in any modern code. The command to lend to an Israelite in his poverty was imperative, but no pledge of *raiment* could be exacted *from a widow.*

Thus in a variety of ways was the Lord pleased to manifest his kindness and compassion for the fatherless and the widow, and in consequence womanhood was honored and honorable in the Jewish nation, beyond anything known in the heathen world. From the vile and degrading orgies of heathenism the women of Israel were exempt. They feared the Lord, and at his hand received blessings and mercies without number. Some of them were prophets, teachers, leaders, and judges. They taught a pure morality, trained their children according to principles of justice and righteousness, and lived in expectation and hope of the coming of that Messiah in whom all the nations of the earth were to be blessed.

These privileges enjoyed by Israelitish women, so much superior to those accorded to women in the surrounding nations, must have inclined many to desire the protection

and security afforded in the commonwealth of Israel. Thus Ruth, having married one Israelitish husband, had no desire to remain in Moab and look for his successor, but said to her mother-in-law, who was returning to the land of Israel, "Whither thou goest, I will go. Thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God." Doubtless others were equally sensible of the advantages of such unions, and hence it was comparatively easy for Jewish men to obtain wives to supply any deficiency that might have existed. Heathen women were all too willing to form such alliances, and the Jews were especially warned against intermarrying with the surrounding nations; for though Jewish men formed the controlling element of the nation, yet heathen women, if they did not embrace the faith of Israel, were an occasion of spiritual decline and apostasy, and especially of idolatry in their children.

MOSAIC INTERDICTIONS.

The prohibitions or interdictions of the Mosaic law have been a favorite butt for the ridicule of infidels, whose blundering criticisms clearly indicate their failure to comprehend the depths of wisdom exhibited in the oracles of God.

Various restrictions are common to all governments. The existence of society depends upon mutual concessions and the curtailment of individual rights. The law of brute force is simple barbarism, and with its establishment civilization ends.

Under the Jewish law there are three expressions which require consideration in this connection. There was first *kāh-dōhsh'*, signifying to be bright, new, fresh, untarnished, clean, consecrated, set apart for a holy use. This word described the ideal sanctity or holiness of the Israelitish nation, and of their worship. The temple and altar, the curtains of the tabernacle, the sacrifices and

shew-bread, the golden lampstand, and all their utensils of worship, were regarded as *kāh-dōhsh'*, or holy. Not that any moral quality could inhere in gold and silver, brass, cloth, or stone, but simply to show that those material things were consecrated to the service of the Most High, and were to be looked upon with reverence, and to be kept sacred from the touch of the common multitude. This word also extended higher in its scope, and described angelic purity, and the spotless holiness of the Most High God.

Another word used among them was *tāh-mēh'*, which signified to be soiled, sullied, polluted, defiled, unholy, *unclean*. As *kāh-dōhsh'* defined that holiness or purity to which a man should attain to enjoy communion with God, *tāh-mēh'* described that pollution, defilement, or uncleanness which he was required to avoid. Those words, therefore, set a bound about the nation of Israel, to prevent their participation in the vices of the surrounding peoples, separating them from the corrupt and idolatrous nations around them, in food, in drink, and in association. They might not attend their idolatrous festivities, sit at their tables, nor eat of their dainties.

While whatever was thus interdicted was termed *tāh-mēh'* or unclean, the word *tāh-hēhr'*, signifying to shine, to be bright, to become clean or pure, was used to describe the condition of those whose ceremonial uncleanness had been *removed* by compliance with the prescriptions of the Mosaic law. This word therefore occupied a middle position; *kāh-dōhsh'* describing the divine holiness, *tāh-mēh'* expressing the depths of human pollution, and *tāh-hēhr'* describing the condition of those who having been polluted had been cleansed and restored to a condition of purity.

We have in this connection especially to consider the force of the term *tāh-mēh'*, or *uncleanness*, which was

used, not necessarily to describe that which was filthy, but that which was prohibited or forbidden. Thus the touch of a dead body made any person *tāh-mēh′*, or unclean; not because material filth necessarily adhered to a person who had touched a corpse, but to broadly mark the distinction between the living and the dead, and to remind men that by sin came death, and also to ensure the speedy removal and interment of the dead, and to prevent that contact with them which so often proves a fruitful source of contagion, disease and death.

An illustration of the force of the term *tāh-mēh′* may be found in the *taboo* of the Polynesians, by which a certain mark or sign affixed to anything renders it *taboo*, and prohibits all people from touching or approaching it.

This ceremonial *tāh-mēh′*, or prohibitory restriction, usually translated "unclean," touched the personal life and conduct of the Israelite at every point, extending its control over his entire existence from birth to burial, regulating his food, his clothing, his daily conduct, and his most secret acts of social and domestic life. He who violated any of these interdictions, himself became *tāh-mēh′*, or unclean, and was forbidden under pain of death to enter the congregation of the Lord, take part in the worship, festivities, or privileges of the children of Israel. While he was *tāh-mēh′* he was required to make himself a social outcast, being obliged to decline all association or contact with his fellow-men, at least for a day, and sometimes for a week or more. He was also required to bathe himself in water, and to perform certain public ceremonies of purification before he could become *tāh-hēhr*,′ and thus regain his ordinary rights and privileges.

If we study these laws, beginning with the eleventh chapter of Leviticus and continuing to the fifteenth, we shall find in them indications of wisdom and evidences of utility which skeptics little suspect. The laws which

pronounced a leper *tāh-mēh'* were of the nature of quarantine restrictions, framed in accordance with the character of that terrible malady, to prevent its spread among the people. The law concerning the "leprosy of the house" contained sanitary regulations which, if enforced to-day, would demolish the mouldy and pestilential rookeries in which civilization hives her poor, and would inaugurate a system of sanitary inspection and improvement such as a modern enlightenment has never yet succeeded in establishing. The numerous ablutions required of those who were *tāh-mēh'* enforced the practice of cleanliness as a religious duty, thus conserving and promoting the health of the nation. The directions regarding clothing are also well worthy of attention, some of them probably being based on sanitary considerations, and others perhaps being intended to guard against the usages of idolatrous nations.

THE LAWS OF MOSES REGARDING FOOD

have been to a great extent substantially adopted among civilized peoples, *most* of the prohibited articles being excluded from their dietary, and the few that are still used might be most advantageously dispensed with.

Perhaps the most marked deviation of civilized nations from the Jewish dietetic code is seen in the prevailing use of swine's flesh, which was strictly forbidden to Israel. The propriety of this interdiction is obvious to the thoughtful. Swine in their natural condition are fierce as beasts of prey, and about as swift as wild horses, and though omnivorous, and hence unclean, may be supposed to be comparatively free from disease. But when civilized and fattened they become so weak and enfeebled that they can hardly move, but lie as helpless lumps of lymph and adipose; and when they are too feeble to walk and can only grunt and eat, they are supposed to be just

fit for food. The lumps which characterize what is known as "measly pork" it is now known when eaten develop into tape-worms in the human body; and the horrors of *trichiniasis* are too well known to need description. An intelligent lady, a teacher in the public schools, who died of this horrible disease in consequence of tasting a single mouthful of uncooked sausage, said to the writer as she was panting for breath, after suffering untold agonies from the myriads of these horrible parasites which were working their way through every fibre of her body, "*Warn the people not to eat pork!*"

The writer many years ago listened to a lecture on health, delivered by Dr. Wieting in Tremont Temple, Boston. To illustrate the process of respiration he introduced the lungs of a pig, and remarked that he had it slaughtered on purpose for the lecture; and that sometimes he found it necessary to have as many *as a dozen pigs killed* before he could get *a pair of sound lungs!* Is it any wonder that people fed on the flesh of these diseased, enfeebled, tuberculous, filthy brutes, should die of consumption through the "mysterious providence of God," who told his people thousands of years ago to let the unclean stuff alone? Levit. xi. 7; Deut. xiv. 8; Isaiah lxiv. 5; lxvi. 17.

Swine were designed to be scavengers, to eat up filth and abominations; but when they had done their work, it was not designed that men should turn around and eat the swine. If people partake of the nature of the food they consume, the eaters of blood becoming bloodthirsty, while those who live upon fruits and similar articles of food are more mild and peaceful, we can imagine what must be the character of persons the main portion of whose food is swine's flesh.

Persons fond of such food will naturally call to mind some person of iron constitution, like one known to the

writer, who claims to have eaten twenty or thirty hogs without evil result; but they will not stop to consider the children of such persons, most of whom die in early life, and of diseases not usually fatal. The fact is, He who forbade his people to eat swine's flesh, undoubtedly had good reasons for so doing,—reasons which probably concern both health and morals.

The celibate communities known in America as Shakers, furnish an illustration of the result of a partial conformity to the Mosaic law in relation to diet. According to a health journal, the Berkshire Shakers were accustomed to eat pork until about the year 1850, when they discontinued the use of it, and since doing so their average age at death has risen from less than *sixty-four* years to over *sixty-eight* years. It is stated that when they made use of pork as an article of food they lost several members of their various families from consumption every year. After abandoning the use of pork, they did not lose a single member from consumption for years, and have actually stamped out the disease from among them.

A rabbi of one of the Jewish synagogues of New York in preaching recently, insisted that the Mosaic food laws had been proved to rest on a scientific foundation and were for the best interests of those following them. A fair illustration of this, he said, is seen in the fact that during the last seven years seventy-eight members of the congregation had been buried, of whom fifty-eight lived in obedience to the food laws, and their ages averaged sixty years. The remaining twenty, who did not so live, had an average life of only forty years.

It is not claimed that Gentiles and Christians are bound by *law* to abstain from all things forbidden to the Jews. But when they learn that all these interdictions are profitable and healthful, it is for them to consider whether they can afford to do things to their own injury, when

their impropriety and hurtfulness have been clearly pointed out in the Mosaic Law.

The salutary restrictions concerning food have undoubtedly tended to promote health and longevity among the Jews. But it is especially in the relations of the sexes, and the control of the natural instincts, that the law concerning *tāh-mēh'* has perhaps its most important application.

The first commandment ever given to man had reference to the perpetuation of the human race. This command was enforced by the implantation of natural instincts sufficiently strong to secure the object desired, but constituting an array of social forces so mighty as to require rigid control and careful guidance, lest they should wreck society, and bury humanity in its own ruins. The first of these restraints was imposed by the divine law ordaining marriage; an institution primitive in its origin and world-wide in its extent. But other restraints were requisite to prevent those excesses which, even within the bonds of wedlock, result in infirmity, disease, and premature decay, working the destruction of health, happiness, and even of life itself.

The experience of ages has also shown that the uncontrolled indulgence of the natural passions, and the unrestrained and unregulated increase of the human family, result in various evils, such as the deterioration of both parents and offspring, the neglect of infancy, and the prevalence of poverty, want, vice, and wretchedness; for which evils modern publicists, politicians, and legislators have hitherto vainly sought to provide a remedy.

In laying the foundations for a new and ideal commonwealth, these dangers were not to be overlooked, but carefully considered and sedulously guarded against. But how was this to be accomplished? It is useless to legislate directly against natural inclinations and appetites. Such laws could never be enforced. Hence, what-

ever is done to effect the desired results must be done *indirectly*, and in such a way as to avoid the resistance which the human will continually offers to every invasion of personal liberty. Evils which cannot be directly legislated out of existence may sometimes be indirectly restrained and prevented by wise and judicious enactments.

LAWS AGAINST IMPURITY.

The law of Moses guarded the purity of womanhood with its sternest sanctions. Outrages upon women were punished with death. The seducer of the Jewish maiden must marry her, if her parents would permit the marriage, and if not, must pay heavily for his misdeed; and while wives taken under other circumstances might be divorced, such a marriage was indissoluble. Adultery was punished by the death of both the guilty parties. Prostitution was a capital crime, and no illegitimate child could enter the congregation of the Lord, or be incorporated in the commonwealth of Israel and possess the rights of a free citizen.

But even these protections would be insufficient to prevent the evils to which we have alluded. To guard against these ills some plan must be devised which would indirectly touch and rigidly control man's personal conduct in the most secret acts of social life.

Among the measures which looked to this result may be mentioned the initiatory rite, the seal of the ancient covenant, which had a direct tendency to foster continence, and prevent vicious indulgence. The dietary of the Jewish nation, both in the articles which it prescribed and those which it excluded, tended to the same result. And finally the statutes concerning *tāh-mēh'* or uncleanness, and purification, were admirably adapted to cover the entire ground. No one could give himself up to the excessive and habitual indulgence of animal passion

without making himself for the time a social outcast, and debarring himself from the services of the sanctuary, and the associations of common life, as a person whose very presence and touch was defilement, and who must perform the prescribed ablutions and ceremonies before he could again stand as an equal among the sons of Israel. The weaknesses and diseases which naturally result from excessive sensual indulgence subjected him to similar disability, and brought his case under the constant notice of parents and priests, thus insuring a speedy remedy.

In addition to this, the Mosaic law cast about the weaker sex the most absolute protection imaginable. Nothing was left to chance, to will, to caprice, or passion. The stern law of God stood sentinel over the health, purity, and welfare of the wife, and preserved the sanctity of the home. For a large proportion of the time the Israelitish wife was *tāh-mēh'*, or forbidden. That word hedged her about on every hand. All contact with her person, her clothing, her bed or her couch, rendered any man guilty of it *tāh-mēh'*, or unclean, and sent him into seclusion from one to seven days, compelling him to bathe his entire person before he could walk forth as a man among men, and participate in the worship, the festivities, and the privileges pertaining to Jewish citizenship. Exod. xix. 10–15; 1 Sam. xxi. 4, 5; Joel ii. 16; 1 Cor. vii. 5.

This *tāh-mēh'*, or prohibition, was so *timed* that its inevitable tendency was to lessen the number of births which would otherwise occur, and at the same time, according to the laws of the human constitution as discovered by modern research, it would secure "the survival of the fittest," the preservation of the most vigorous germs of human existence, thus tending to produce a people physically superior to other nations who lived without such wholesome restraints.

Thus the regulation of the social life of the Hebrew was

not left to chance, passion, or blind and unreasoning impulse; but the lawlessness of human nature was met, not by the remonstrances of weakness and helplessness, but by *the stern law of God*, which like a flaming sword turned every way to protect the defenseless, and guard the purity and integrity of the home. And as each indulgence of the natural passions was followed by a period of *tāh–mēh′*, or seclusion, the inconvenience of which is manifest, the natural tendency of the law was to cultivate virtue, foster self-control, school the Jewish nation in continence and chastity, and insure the perpetuation of a healthful and virtuous population.

Another thing has excited the anger and contempt of skeptics, namely, the provision by which the birth of a son rendered the mother *tāh-mēh′* for a period of forty days. Skeptics descant solemnly upon the sacredness of motherhood, and deride these laws as unworthy of a divine lawgiver; but the finer instincts of womanhood will at once perceive the utility of a provision which, for a period of forty days, secluded and sacredly protected mothers, shielding them from all approach, intrusion and contact, and so insuring and preserving that proverbial health of the Hebrew women, who as long ago as the time of Pharaoh, unlike the Egyptian women, were "lively," and able to protect their offspring from destruction. Such a provision as this could only have a most salutary effect upon a community, its tendency being to prevent an over-production of ill-born and sickly children, avoid the dangers of over-population, and preserve the strength and vigor of the mothers in Israel.

But infidelity has found another theme for scoffing in the fact that after the birth of a female child the mother was *tāh-mēh′* for *eighty days*, or twice as long as after the birth of a son. Such a law as this surely must be one of "the mistakes of Moses!" But it is not well for

skeptics to form hasty conclusions. Perhaps Moses knew more about his business than skeptics do.

There is, as it is well known, in consequence of the exposure of men to various dangers, a tendency to an excess of females in civilized communities. And such an excess forms a disturbing, if not a dangerous, element in society, destroying the natural balance of the sexes, and in some cases leading to serious evils; as may be seen in Great Britain, where a preponderance of 800,000 females leads to such horrible exhibitions of vice and sin as cannot be openly described. We know how female infants have been destroyed by their parents in non-Christian lands, and all are familiar with the bitterness of the lot of Oriental women, where the mutilation of the opposite sex tends to still further derange the natural balance of the race, and so prepare the way for the spread of polygamy and the horrors of the harem.

A facetious writer, after narrating her experiences in a vain endeavor to secure employment in an overcrowded city, ventured to suggest that some Herod who would devote his time to the destruction of *female* infants would be a public benefactor. This is substantially the solution of the problem arrived at by the Chinese, which illustrates the exalted moral and social tendency of the teachings of Confucius and Buddha, so dear to skeptical hearts, and which renders necessary such notifications as the one found by a missionary who, visiting the grounds of a Chinese nobleman, and passing among the venerable trees, shady paths, and beside the beautiful lake, with its bridges and islands and summer houses, saw on a large sign, in Chinese characters,

"PLEASE DON'T DROWN GIRLS HERE."

Christians are horrified at such a condition of things, but there is a Godless and Christless heathenism at their own doors which leads to results tenfold more horrible

than death in infancy and innocence. The poet who had gazed upon wrecked and ruined womanhood, crushed by poverty and toil, and then trampled by the unclean hoofs of unbridled lust, uttered the wail,

"O God! that bread should be so dear,
And flesh and blood so cheap!"

and this cheapness of flesh and blood is the direct result of an excess of the female population, in a sinful and vicious community.

In a perfect condition of society, without deaths from vice or violence, there might be no inconvenient excess of the female sex under the ordinary birth-rate; and in a pure and well-ordered community, such excess, if it existed, might be attended by no special evil results. But fallen humanity is far from perfection, and the evils resulting from this state of things are neither few nor small.

The rule of *force* which *ever* prevails outside the influence of the Scriptures, makes woman's lot one of subjection and degradation; and an excess of females in any locality, under these circumstances tends to cheapen and degrade them. But no such cheapening and wastefulness of God's precious handiwork was possible under the provisions of the Mosaic law; for the natural tendency of the extension of this period of maternal seclusion after the birth of a female child, would be to *slightly reduce* the number of births of *females;* the births in families composed mostly of girls being thus less frequent and less numerous than in the case of the opposite sex. An excess of male births of course would be an element of special strength to the Jewish nation. For, while a Jewish maiden who married a Gentile lost her nationality, a Jew marrying a Gentile woman brought her into the nation, and so increased its strength. And it is stated that even to the present day, as might be expected from this law,

the proportion of births of males to females is greater among the Jews than among their Gentile neighbors; the tables showing that among the Jews 112 boys are born to 100 girls; while among the Gentiles there are but 105 boys to 100 girls; giving the Jews an excess of *seven per cent.* over the Gentiles in the birth-rate of *males.**

By such simple and effective enactments—the full purport and value of which was probably not apparent to many even of those who obeyed them—did the law of Moses secure ends which all other human legislation has failed to effect, preserving the purity of the family, the health of the parents, the vigor of their offspring, maintaining the balance of the sexes, preventing over-population, and quietly and indirectly effecting results which the wisest human lawgivers have been powerless to accomplish; and this in accordance with physiological laws of which the world has been in ignorance for ages, and which have only been discovered in our own generation.†

Such a law, imposed on Christendom to-day, would be a priceless boon to thousands who are walking in weariness and wretchedness toward open graves. It would stay the ravages of dire and deadly diseases, would foster affection, hinder quarrels, prevent disgust and divorce, and produce a chaste, vigorous, self-centred race, superior in moral character and stamina to anything which modern

* Valuable Jewish vital statistics may be found in *The Life of Christ*, by Prof. Sepp of Munich.

† Renouard, in his *History of Medicine*, translated by Dr. Comegys, as quoted by Prof. L. T. Townsend, makes these statements: "The writings of Moses constitute a precious monument in the history of medicine, for they embrace hygienic rules of the highest sagacity. . . . In reading, for instance, those precepts designed to regulate the relation of a man to his wife, one cannot repress a sentiment of admiration for the wisdom and foresight which made such salutary regulations a religious duty. . . . Apart from the religious ceremonies connected with them, might it not be said that they are extracts from a modern work on hygienics? But what more than this excites the astonishment of physicians, is the tableaux that Moses has made of the White Leprosy, and the regulations he established to prevent its propagation."—*The Bible in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 42.

usage and custom is likely to develop; preventing those weaknesses and ailments which send men to unscrupulous quacks as sheep to the slaughter; guiding the erring for counsel to the priests, whose lips were to keep knowledge; and laying a foundation for a physical vigor like that of the Jewish race, which more than thirty centuries has failed to deteriorate or destroy. The continence and the ablutions, now prescribed by physicians, were then made *obligatory* by divine *law*, which went to the fountain head, demanding that *men* should be holy in body and in spirit, excluding the transgressor and the sensualist from the house and worship of God under pain of death, and making possible a pure domestic life in the midst of the pervading apostasy and corruption. These few Mosaic laws were worth more to the Jewish nation than tons of quack medicines, and cart-loads of books written by physicians to instruct people in their duties in these respects. And though infidels may scoff at them, their wives would doubtless hail them as a priceless boon, if they could only understand their import. And we should see fewer faded women and fewer jaded men, if the people of this age were instructed to conform their lives to the healthful interdictions and requirements of the Mosaic law.

THE POOR MAN'S LAW.

It has been said most bitterly, that "There is one law for the poor and another for the rich." We need not bring proofs of the truth of this statement. Every one knows that laws are usually framed by wealthy and influential people, and to a great extent they are framed in the interest of the rich, and not for the benefit of the poor; and it is to such facts that we owe many of the revolutions and rebellions which convulse the world.

The law of Moses was especially a poor man's law. Not that injustice was to be done in the interest or for

the benefit of the poor. Right is right, whether among rich or poor. So it was said, "Thou shalt not speak in a cause to turn aside after a multitude to wrest judgment, neither shalt thou *favor the poor man* in his cause." Ex. xxiii. 2, 3. "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment. Thou shalt not *respect the person of the poor*, nor honor the person of the mighty; but in righteousness thou shalt judge thy neighbor." Lev. xix. 15.

But having thus guarded against the injustice of favoring a poor man in judgment because he *was* poor, the Lawgiver proceeds to protect and provide for the poor. "If there be with thee a poor man, one of thy brethren, ... thou shalt not harden thine heart, nor shut thine hand from thy poor brother, but thou shalt open thine hand unto him, and shalt surely *lend him sufficient for his need* in that which he wanteth. . . . Thou shalt surely *give* him, and thine heart *shall not be grieved* when thou givest unto him. . . . For the poor shall never cease out of the land; therefore I command thee, saying, Thou shalt open thine hand unto thy brother, to thy *poor*, and to thy *needy*." Deut. xv. 7–11. "And when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of thy field, neither shalt thou gather the gleaning of thy harvest; and thou shalt not glean thy vineyard, neither shalt thou gather the fallen fruit of thy vineyard; thou shalt *leave them for the poor* and for the stranger. . . . Thou shalt not oppress thy neighbor, neither rob him. The wages of a hired servant shall not abide with thee all night until the morning. Thou shalt not curse the deaf, nor put a stumbling-block before the blind; but thou shalt fear thy God." Lev. xix. 9–14. "And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself." Lev. xix. 33, 34.

"Six years thou shalt sow thy land and shalt gather in the increase thereof, but the seventh year thou shalt let it rest and lie fallow, that the *poor of thy people* may eat." Exod. xxiii. 10–11.

"If thy brother be waxen poor, and hath sold away some of his possession, and if any of his kin come to redeem it, then shall he redeem that which his brother sold. And if the man have none to redeem it, and himself be able to redeem it; then let him count the years of the sale thereof, and restore the overplus unto the man to whom he sold it, that he may return unto his possession. But if he be not able to restore it to him, then that which is sold shall remain in the hand of him that hath bought it until the year of jubilee; and in the jubilee it shall go out, and he shall return unto his possession. Lev. xxv. 25–27.

"If thou lend money to any of my people that is *poor* by thee, thou shalt not be unto him as an usurer, neither shalt thou *lay upon him usury*. If thou at all take thy neighbor's raiment to pledge, thou shalt restore it unto him by that the sun goeth down; for that is his covering only, it is his raiment for his skin; wherein shall he sleep? and it shall come to pass, when he crieth unto me, that I will hear; for I am gracious." Exod. xxii. 25–27. "When thou dost lend thy neighbor any manner of loan, thou shalt *not go into his house* to fetch his pledge. Thou shalt *stand without*, and the man to whom thou dost lend shall bring forth the pledge without unto thee. And if he be a *poor* man, thou shalt not sleep with his pledge; thou shalt surely restore to him the pledge when the sun goeth down, that he may sleep in his garment, and bless thee; and it shall be righteousness unto thee before the Lord thy God. Thou shalt not oppress an hired servant that is *poor* and needy, whether it be of thy brethren or of thy strangers that are in thy land

within thy gates; in his day thou shalt give him his hire, neither shall the *sun go down upon it;* for he is poor, and setteth his heart upon it; lest he cry against thee unto the Lord, and it be sin unto thee." Deut. xxiv. 10–15.

The highest fine imposed by Moses in punishment for any crime was about fifteen dollars. Money of course was much more valuable then than now, but such a law could not be regarded as oppressive.

The law of Moses made no provision for imprisonment for debt. Other nations have crowded their prisons with men whose only crime was poverty. It is said that in the eighteenth century, four thousand unhappy individuals were condemned to prison every year for misfortune and poverty, and were treated like criminals and outcasts. Oglethorpe succeeded in 1728, with the aid of Parliament, in delivering from jail great multitudes of these unhappy creatures. In the United States, even as late as 1829, it was estimated that there were as many as 3000 unfortunate debtors confined in the prisons of Massachusetts, 10,000 in New York, 7000 in Pennsylvania, 3000 in Maryland, and a like proportion in other states. It was not until between 1821 and 1845 that imprisonment for debt in the United States was abolished except where fraud was reasonably suspected.*

The land laws of Israel were framed especially for the poor. The land was divided by lot among the different tribes of Israel, and this division, dating back to the establishment of the nation in Palestine, clearly shows that the law under which they held their land was not an invention of modern writers or legislators, but was given by Moses before they entered into Palestine. The law of Moses provided for every man a home and a farm. He was born heir to land, and his homestead was inalienable.

* See E. L. Brace, *Gesta Christi*, pp. 409, 410.

He could not be dispossessed of his inheritance. In case of poverty he might lease his land until the year of jubilee, or bind himself to servitude for a limited period, but at the year of jubilee all conveyances of land were void except those transferring houses or gardens within the limits of cities or villages. These could be sold absolutely; but the land itself, the farms and vineyards and fields no man could sell. An improvident father could not dispossess his children of their rights in the land of Israel. Nor could any creditor, by any claim, possess himself in perpetuity of his neighbor's land. "Homestead exemption," which has been advocated by some, is simply a provision of the old Mosaic law; just as the provision by which debts outlaw at the end of six years is a relic and reminder of the institution of the Sabbatic year among the Israelites, when debts were canceled and bondmen went free.

This division of land laid the foundation for an independent, diligent, and thrifty community; and had this land system been incorporated in modern law, as have other provisions of Mosaic law, how different would have been the condition of vast multitudes of people to-day, who, destitute of land, have been crowded into cities and villages, where they have not a spot on earth which they can call their own, and do not even possess a grave.

For instance, in Scotland the land amounts to nearly nineteen millions of acres (18,946,694). Of this amount twelve persons hold more than one-fifth, or over four millions of acres (4,339,672), and seventy persons hold 9,400,000 acres. Seventeen hundred persons hold nine-tenths of the whole territory of Scotland, leaving for the three and a half or four millions of people who remain less than two millions of acres (1,894,669). Is it any wonder that tens of thousands of families are living crowded into single rooms in the great cities of Scotland?

The area of Great Britain, outside of London, contains a little more than seventy-two millions of acres of land (72,117,766). This would allow about two acres to each inhabitant. But of this land, more than one-fifth of the whole, or over fifteen millions of acres (15,303,165), belongs to 525 of the nobility, comprising 28 dukes, 33 marquises, 194 earls, 52 viscounts, and 218 barons. Below the nobles are about 10,911 landed gentry, each owning one thousand or more acres of land. The 11,436 nobles and landed gentry thus possess over fifty-two millions of acres of land (52,083,095), thus owning more than two-thirds of the soil of Great Britain, leaving a little more than twenty millions of acres of land (20,034,671), to be divided among the thirty-four or five million inhabitants, which if equally distributed would allow them less than two-thirds of an acre each. But as this is mostly contained in farms of less than a thousand acres, a very large proportion of the people never possess one foot of land, until they are buried.

Both the Old and the New Testaments are full of commands, precepts, and exhortations to care for the poor. What other nation ever had a law compelling men to lend to the poor without interest? What other nation ever had a law allowing the poor and the traveler to eat and fill their hands with fruit from any vineyards and orchards which they passed, only prohibiting their taking any vessels or bags with them to carry fruit away?* What other law ever forbade the taking a pledge from a widow for her indebtedness, or required a pawned garment to be returned to a poor man at night? What other nation

*A poor man in Scotland, in 1885, was charged with having stolen *two apples* from a garden in Dundee. The person pleaded guilty, declaring that he was at the time *starving* for want of food. The magistrate said he "could have applied for relief at the proper quarter," and sentenced him to *forty days' imprisonment.* And while these lines were being written, a little boy not ten years old was lying in jail in Boston for taking *two pears* from a neighbor's yard.

ever had laws requiring that the wages of the workman should be paid, not quarterly, monthly, or weekly, but before sunset *every night?* What other nation had a law forbidding men to curse the deaf, or put a stumbling-block in the path of the blind? What other nation had a law forbidding the husbandman to reap the corners of his fields, or gather the gleanings of his harvest, or the scattering grapes of his vineyard; but commanding him to leave them for the poor and the stranger? What other people had a law which forbade the muzzling of the ox as he was treading out the corn, or which protected the birds upon their nests, and commanded men to show kindness to beasts in distress, even though they belonged to their enemies? What other nation had a law which required men to love their neighbors as themselves, and forbade them to cherish grudges against them, and prohibited malice, tale-bearing, and revenge? What other nation ever had a law which gave every man an inheritance of land, and so secured it that even the king on his throne could not take it from him; and so arranged it that if he himself was compelled to part with his land, he could not sell it outright, but could redeem it at any time when able, and if not, at the end of the jubilee period his children could go and claim their ancient inheritance? What nation, outside the influence of the law of Moses, ever had a law which sacredly reserved every seventh day for *rest*, and forbade people to require or permit their servants, or their beasts, to do any servile work on that day?* Surely, if there ever was a law which was emphatically a *law for the poor*, the law of Moses was that law. We might search the records of all ages, from

* For facts in relation to the Sabbatic law, indicating its salutary character and its adaptation to the physical necessities of both man and beast, consult the author's pamphlets, *Remarks on "The Mistakes of Moses,"* p. 16, and *Atheism and Arithmetic*, chapter iv.; being Nos. 6 and 15 of the ANTI-INFIDEL LIBRARY.

the beginning to the present time, without finding another law so favorable to the poor, so full of sympathy, humanity, righteousness, and truth, as this law. And the necessity for it is obvious. The rich can care for themselves, but the poor need protection. They cannot cope with power and wealth, and their struggles against oppression often plunge them into deeper woes, from which human lawgivers fail to extricate them. But God in his law remembered the poor—it was the poor man's law; and when the gospel came, it was a grand proof of Christ's Messiahship that to the *poor* the gospel was preached.

THE ORIGIN OF THE MOSAIC LAW.

There can be no law without a lawgiver. All laws must spring from some authoritative law-giving power. No private individual can make or enforce a law. Whence, then, did the Jewish nation derive their law? The law exists, and has maintained its existence for ages. How did it originate? Most laws when promulgated, bear upon them the story of their origin, as enacted by parliament, or by some legislative body, ordained by the assembled representatives of the people, or issued as the decrees of some king or autocrat. They must have authority from some source behind them, or no one will accept or heed them. If the law be proved a forgery, it at once loses all right to our regard; it is a mere nullity.

But that nation had no law-making power; they had no legislative body; but their kings and executive officers were solemnly charged to read, study, and enforce laws which were already made. A multitude of vexatious and petty restrictions have since derived a partial authority from the traditions of the elders, but none of them ever had the force of laws, or were universally accepted. Prudential regulations were instituted in cases of emergency by the assembled heads of the tribes; but these

did not affect nor supersede the fundamental laws of the land, which were unchanged and unchangeable.

Now these laws must have been made at some time and place, and by some law-making power. They could not have been imposed upon the people without some authority. Since other laws have the date of their enactment, and the place where and the authority by whom they were enacted, surely if the laws of Israel were of human origin they should bear some token of authorship and authority. They were not borrowed from other nations, for no other nation ever had such laws; they were not ordained by kings, for they existed before the kings were born. In them was embodied the title by which every Israelite held his farm and his home; and as Israel never had a parliament or a legislature, assembling annually to make laws, and as no acts of any such Jewish law-making body are on record, the only reasonable conclusion at which we can arrive is that the law under which the Israelites lived was given on Mount Sinai at the time of the founding of their commonwealth.

Every page of the Mosaic law gives evidence of the circumstances of its origin in the wilderness of Sinai. It speaks not of temples, palaces, and cities, but of the camp, and the tabernacle, the pillar of cloud and fire, the dropping manna, and water from the smitten rock; and it continually points forward to future days, when Israel should enter their own land, and be established there as a nation, and dwell in peace within their own borders.

The endless details connected with the erection of the tabernacle and the requirements of the Jewish law, forbid the thought of forgery or fiction. The directions for building the tabernacle; the boards, the corners, tenons, pillars, sockets, and vails; the measurements, cubits, and all the details of architecture, bear the unmistakable impress of reality. No writer of fiction would

fill sixteen chapters with such dry particulars and details. So accurate are the specifications of material, form, and size, that a skillful mechanic, taking the books of Moses, can reconstruct every part of the ancient tabernacle, and exhibit it as an illustration of the accuracy of the specifications contained in the Mosaic law.

The book of Leviticus gives us an account of the establishment of certain ordinances, rites, sacrifices, laws and rules, concerning food, raiment, marriage, health, etc.; and true Jews to this day, though scattered throughout the world, *observe these laws* so far as their circumstances will permit. They do not eat of the things forbidden in the book of Leviticus; they bathe themselves as commanded, and attend to the hygienic prescriptions contained in that book. Why do they, in all quarters of the globe, observe these same requirements, unless they were once the laws of a united nation? And how came that *nation* ever to observe those laws which claim a divine origin, unless the Jewish nation *knew* they were laws given to Israel by God through Moses?

Some modern critics, who, while indebted to Christianity for education, position, and support, devote their time to proving that the Bible is the work of impostors and deceivers, assert that the books of Moses were probably forged by some zealous priestly reformers, who were endeavoring to effect a restoration of the ancient worship and a reformation among the Israelites, perhaps about the time of the reign of King Josiah.

It has been suggested that we may sometimes find out the real character of a man by ascertaining what he thinks of his neighbors. The fact that teachers occupying such positions hold that falsehood, deception, and forgery, are the means by which "reformers" accomplish their work, illustrates the peculiar notions of religion and reformation held by these critics.

Our view of anything depends largely upon the standpoint which we occupy. And many of the critics of the present day occupy positions confessedly different from those which the Scriptures assign to Moses the man of God, and to the prophets who had communion with heaven and walked in fellowship with their Maker. Men so situated and so constituted have little in common with the holy men of old who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Their lives are very different from the lives of those men who wandered in sheepskins and goatskins, and were destitute, afflicted, tormented. Men whose learned lucubrations are largely produced under the inspiration of lager beer and tobacco smoke, will naturally see things in a different light from those ancient and heroic saints whose lives were devoted to the cause of a heavenly Master, and whose hearts were on fire with loving zeal and fidelity to his work.

When persons say that Moses imposed upon the people, and gave them laws which he *pretended* came from heaven, we may possibly get a better idea of the critics than of the man whom they so severely criticise. Moses the man of God, who as a legislator occupied the highest position that any human legislator has ever occupied, and gave a system of laws superior to any system possessed by any nation that ever lived in any land *outside of the influence of those laws*, was in their view simply a patriotic liar, a philanthropic fraud, a pious cheat, a deceiver who humbugged and deluded the people. This is *their* estimate of the character of the giver of the greatest and most important code of laws the world has ever seen.

But if Moses deceived the children of Israel, and induced them to believe that God had given them a law on Mount Sinai which he simply invented in a thunder storm, then are we to suppose that he also deluded them into the idea that they made brick in the land of Egypt; that they

were sorely oppressed; that the first-born of Egypt were slain; that they came through the Red Sea dry-shod; and that they wandered forty years in the wilderness, being fed with manna from heaven and refreshed with water from the smitten rock?

It is certain that the Israelites for ages immemorial have believed these things; it is equally certain that they could *not* have believed and received the books of Moses without receiving these things; and the man who finds it easier to accept all these impossible absurdities, rather than to believe that God has given his creatures a revelation of his law, would fitly illustrate the remark of the Hindoo Brahmin who said to Dr. William Ramsey, "Sahib, a little truth is hard, but a *big lie is easy to be believed!*"

If it be alleged that Moses borrowed his institutions to some extent from the Egyptians, this only recalls another fact, that generations before Moses was born, for a period of eighty years, Joseph, the son of Jacob, controlled the destinies of Egypt, and was appointed by Pharaoh "to bind his princes at pleasure, and *teach his senators wisdom.*" Psa. cv. 22. If there was anything good in the institutions of Egypt, it may be largely attributed to the wisdom of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as manifested in Joseph, whose "bow abode in strength," and whose arms "were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob."

But though some principles of justice and righteousness are common to all laws, because without them society could not exist, yet the laws of the Israelites differed widely from the laws of Egypt. Egypt was under the despotic rule of a king; Israel was the world's first republic,—a government of the people, and for the people. The subjects of Pharaoh were slaves; the nation of Israel were freemen. Pharaoh ruled Egypt; the nation ruled

Israel. The Egyptian government was founded in force; the Hebrew commonwealth arose on the free consent of the people.* In Egypt the will of the king was supreme; in Palestine the law of God was above king, or priest, or prophet; the standard by which was to be tested the conduct of both prince and peasant. Under the laws of Egypt that nation sunk into groveling idolatries, and has now become the basest of kingdoms; while under the laws of Moses, Israel, though chastened and dispersed, yet maintain their existence and influence, and defy the ravages of time and the changes of an inconstant world.

Says the Chief Justice of New Jersey, while referring to these who talk of the dignity of human nature, in itself considered, without the aid of divine revelation:

"When these giants in human intellect can tell me whence Moses derived his science in legislation, without admitting the supernatural and divine authority of the Ten Commandments, I shall begin to listen with more reverence to the teachers of human perfectibility. In that short and comprehensive code, we find given us a perfect rule of action, covering the whole ground of man's existence; a rule not only prescribing our duty to God and man in our external behaviour, but reaching to the secret thoughts and feelings of hearts in every possible condition of life, and in all our relations to our Maker and our fellow beings. The wisdom of ages, the learning and philosophy of the schools, have never discovered a single defect in that code. Not a virtue which is not there inculcated. Not a vice in its most doubtful and shadowy form, which is not there prohibited. Whence then, I ask, did the great Jewish lawgiver derive his spirit of legislation? If that code was written by the finger of the Almighty, let us bow to it with reverence, and seek no better rule of life, nor any wiser principle of action. But

*Exodus xix. 8; xxiv. 3; Deut. v. 27; Joshua xxiv. 16–27.

if they emanated only from the capacious mind and were dictated by the wisdom of Moses,—then Moses was a wiser, a more learned man than any of our new teachers; and I had rather be under his jurisdiction and keep his commandments, than learn new rules of civil polity and social intercourse from the most learned and wise of the present day."*

WAS MOSES' LAW THE WORK OF PRIESTS?

It is sometimes flippantly asserted that the Jewish law was concocted by a pack of priests, to deceive and defraud the people. This is incredible; for the Jewish law forbade the priests to hold any real estate except a house and garden. The tribe of Levi, from which all the priests came, was the *only* tribe which was deprived of the privilege of holding landed property. Now priests are very much like other people; they are inclined to take care of themselves and look after their own interests. Indeed, in modern times the priests have sometimes succeeded in monopolizing most of the land in the country, and revolutions have been necessary to extricate the soil from their grasp. No priest ever made a law forbidding himself and his fellow priests to hold real estate. Priests do not bite off their own noses. If priests had made the law they would probably have reserved to themselves a double share of the land, instead of cutting themselves off from holding any of it.

If it be claimed that these laws were the work of priestly impostors, the question arises, how came these priestly impostors, who were themselves cheats, liars and hypocrites, to invent laws exceeding in excellence all that the wisest legislators have produced? And by what means could such priestly hypocrites enforce upon the people distasteful and unwelcome laws, when according

* Chief Justice Hornblower. *Charge to the Grand Jury of Essex County.* Jan. 7, 1843.

to their own laws they themselves possessed no legislative power, and had not even authority to collect their own tithes, being solely dependent upon the voluntary contributions which the people brought for their support?

If it be asserted that these laws were enacted by some body of Israelitish legislators, then it may be asked how a barbarous nation, *without any law whatever*, or with only a rudimentary and imperfect legal system, was able to frame, invent, contrive, and originate a system of laws superior to anything produced by the wisest legistors of ancient or modern times.

The great test of excellence in the skeptical world is "the survival of the fittest." Judged by this rule the Mosaic law is the fittest; for it has survived all others. Could such a law have been originated by lawless barbarians, or hypocritical priests, or leaders who had no opportunity for instruction in righteousness, and whose lives perpetually outraged the principles upon which the law is based? The law is here as a fact. It claims divine origin. Those who deny that it came from God will do well to trace it to its source. The fountain from which it sprang was higher than Jewish barbarism or priestly hypocrisy and fraud.

LAW AND CIVILIZATION.

There can be no civilization without law. In its absence, society relapses into anarchy and barbarism. But the Israelitish people were civilized, and hence must have been under law. The Israelites were mainly agriculturists; but agriculture is impossible without the protection of law. They were land-holders; but men cannot hold land without the guardianship of law. The nation of Israel was a republic; but a republic is only practicable where the people are educated and fitted for self-government. The judges and rulers of Israel were elected from among the

people, and ruled by popular consent; but popular election presupposes subjection to law. Where law does not exist, the will of the strongest becomes the rule, and the result is disorder and despotism. The Israelites possessed an educational and religious system, and one of the twelve tribes was set apart for this work, and its members were scattered among the other tribes for this purpose. The Israelites had also sanitary laws, which are still observed, and which make them the most healthful people on earth. The family life of Israel was under the control of laws which were most wise and beneficent. The execution of justice was provided for by law; the defense of the land was committed to a citizen soldiery; and the government, whether republican or monarchial, was based upon a written constitution, and fundamental and unchangeable laws.

These facts clearly show that the nation of Israel must have had a law, and a law framed in accordance with the requirements of human nature, and in some respects in advance of the highest type of human government now in existence.

Whether a law which forbids all sin and inculcates all virtue, which has outlived the laws of all ancient emperors and conquerors, which has entered into the jurisprudence of the world, and exercises to-day a greater influence on the morals and manners of the world than any other law that was ever made,—whether such a law was a fraudulent trick of a contemptible, hypocritical liar and impostor, or whether this law, the most perfect that the world has ever seen, sprang from the bosom of God, the fountain of all law, and was sent forth for the guidance of the erring sons of men who were groping in darkness and dying in despair, is a question which seems easy to answer. Man, as a being possessing moral nature and distinguishing between right and wrong, must be the

creature of a Creator who loves the good and hates the evil, who has linked sin with sorrow, and righteousness with blessing. And if the Creator desires the well-being and well-doing of men, why should he not make known his desires to his creatures, and place them on record for their instruction? But if there be any such law which bears the impress of the divine hand, and which exhibits energies analogous to a divine vitality, it is that law which came by Moses, which flames forth among the nations as a cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night, in the darkness of a world of heathenism, pollution, and sin.

It is not easy to produce a complete and perfect law. The work of the wisest lawgivers exhibits many defects. Most codes of laws have grown up gradually, and have been based on the experience of successive generations. The great lawgivers of the world, from Lycurgus, Draco, Solon, and Numa, down to Justinian and Napoleon, have given codes to people who were already subject to law, and whose organization had become established by the slow processes of national development. The great philosophers, Pythagoras, Zoroaster, and Confucius, delivered their sage counsels to their fellow-citizens, to be accepted or rejected as their judgment should approve. Mohammed, after fifteen years of solitary meditation, after an acquaintance with the Mosaic and other systems of law, built up a code and presented it to a people who were already subject to government and law.

Moses began at the beginning. After forty years' sojourning in the wilderness he came to Egypt. A stranger, without force or arms, he undertook to found a new nation. But before he could establish a government for the Israelites, he must conquer their oppressors, he must kindle a spirit of liberty within the hearts of the Israelitish bondmen; he must organize them into a nation, he must find them a country in which to dwell, and give

them a code of laws in obedience to which they could live and prosper through successive ages. He did all this; and though the other philosophers, statesmen, and legislators of antiquity have sunk into the depths of forgetfulness; and though the Israelitish nation is broken up, their capital destroyed, and their land desolated, and they are dispersed and mingled among all the nations of the earth; yet not only do they maintain their existence, but the whole civilized world feels the quickening influence of the law which Moses gave, which, joined with Christianity, has purified their social institutions, destroyed paganism, established civil liberty, modified legislation, and infused into civilization those principles which, more than any others, have elevated and blessed mankind.

DO THE LAW AND GOSPEL AGREE?

There are persons who object to the Law of Moses as being not in accordance with the Gospel of Christ. They say the Old Testament and the New Testament do not agree. And why *should* they agree? The Old Testament contains a code of *laws*, which describe sin and condemn sinners. The New Testament contains a message of *mercy*, which gives sinners hope, and offers pardon to the guilty. The Old Testament gives directions for the orderly establishment of a commonwealth, and for the government of a single nation located on a limited territory in Palestine. The New Testament records a message peculiar to no nation, designed to be sent into all the world, but containing no rules whatever for the establishment of any commonwealth, or any civil government for any nation. From the New Testament we should never learn the duties of kings, judges, rulers, or government officials. The New Testament only teaches that men should submit to rulers, and so govern themselves that they will need no other governing. The New Testament points out no way to establish a government, to

execute laws, to punish the rebel, the thief, the murderer, or the transgressor, in this world. The Old Testament gives directions for the establishment of a government, the administration of justice and the punishment of crime.

Of course the Old Testament and the New do not agree, for they were never intended to agree. Those who expect them to agree know little of either. A chart of the eastern coast of North America would not agree with the chart of the northern coast of Africa. Why should they agree? They refer to different matters. Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* would not be expected to agree with the latest treatise on the theory and practice of medicine; nor would a volume of statute laws be expected to agree with a book of gospel hymns.

Before we decide that the Old and New Testaments contradict each other we need to study the purpose of the law of Moses as distinguished from the gospel of Christ. When we comprehend the character of both, and distinguish between the two, we shall hear no more about the contradictions existing between the Law and the Gospel.

THE LAW OF MOSES NOT ARBITRARY, BUT SALUTARY.

The time would fail us to point out all the excellencies of this wonderful Law. The more carefully we examine its provisions, the more clearly we shall see that its prescriptions were not arbitrary; that its requirements were in agreement with the nature of things; and that long life, health, peace and prosperity came by its observance. Of course there are many people too wise to be taught by Moses. They will eat pork, and suffer with tapeworms, or die of *trichiniasis;* they will give loose rein to animal passions, and become decrepit and prematurely old; they will neglect the prescribed ablutions, and die of dirt and cholera; they will cut their mustaches and ruin their eyesight, and shave their throats till they suffer and die of

bronchitis and consumption; they will eat all manner of mixtures and abominations, and then dose and doctor to cure the dyspepsia; they will disregard the weekly day of rest, and consequently suffer from nervous prostration, and be obliged to take a six months' vacation to recuperate their wasted energies; they will disregard the provision for rest from business every seventh year, and push and struggle on until about the tenth year, when overproduction will glut the markets, and bring widespread panic and financial distress, as has been the case every ten years for a century and a half; they will prate about "the mistakes of Moses," deride the wisdom of godly old age and pious experience, and sneer at the notions of those "old fogies" who believe their Bibles, and whose hoary heads are crowns of glory, being found in the way of righteousness; but they will never notice that while the house of prayer is often filled with "*old* fogies," the haunts of vice and sin are thronged only by "*young* fogies," for most of the Devil's "fogies" *never get to be old*, because he sends them to their graves in their brown hair; for those who disregard the requirements of God's law do not live out half their days.

The skepticism of the age busies itself about "the mistakes of Moses," but why the mistakes of *Moses* rather than any one else? There were millions of men who lived in the time of Moses, and before his time, and after his time,— why do we not hear something about *their* mistakes? Why do not infidels discuss the mistakes of Pharaoh, the mistakes of Nimrod, the mistakes of Sennacherib, and Nebuchadnezzar, and Belshazzar? Why is it that *Moses* must be singled out from all the men of antiquity and subjected to criticism and reproach? That fact indicates the position which Moses occupies in this world. No man can be named in all the ages before Christ, so prominent, so noteworthy, so influential, as Moses. We know

more of his life, his history, his character, his acts, than of any other man who lived during three thousand years. The nation which he founded has survived all its contemporaries; the institutions which he established have outlived all the other civil and social institutions of that age. The religious worship which he ordained has outlasted all the worship of those days; and if we should traverse the east,—Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Assyria, and Arabia, we should find to-day not one example of the idolatrous worship which then overspread those lands. Not one of the deities then worshiped is to-day adored or honored by any living man. The worship of the holy bulls, golden calves, consecrated cats, divine crocodiles, sacred monkeys, and adorable vegetables of Egypt is utterly abolished, and those deities have left behind them only hideous sculptures, mummied carcasses, vague traditions, and indecent memorials. The temples where the Phenicians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Greeks and Romans worshiped their gods of high and low degree are in ruins, and not one of those deities is now adored. But over the wreck of ruined temples, and prostrate images and idols that have been cast to the moles and bats, there comes a voice, which, rolling down through more than thirty stormy centuries, and sounding not only through the length and breadth of the civilized world, but among the nations which still sit in darkness and the shadow of death, proclaims that mighty word which Moses testified of old, "*The Lord our God is one Lord*, and Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy might." Deut. vi. 4, 5. The ancient oracles are dumb; the images of Egypt are forsaken; the idols and idolatries which were followed by the rich, the learned, the cultured, and the mighty of those times are lost in eternal oblivion; while the words which Moses spake are held in everlasting remembrance,

and the God whom Moses served is known and honored in all lands and among all nations.

There were many laws and many lawgivers in ancient times. The Pharaohs issued their mandates, the Assyrian monarchs uttered their decrees, the proud rulers of Babylon sent forth their commands for the government of the peoples whom they had conquered, the laws of the Medes and Persians were unchangeable, and other nations had their different codes,—but where are they all to-day? Buried in eternal forgetfulness. Even wise men seek in vain to find them, and no man is so abject as to fear or obey them. But the law that was given by Moses on Mount Sinai, the law which was laid up in the ancient tabernacle, and borne through all the changeful scenes of Israel's ancient pilgrimage; the law which ruled king and prince, priest and peasant, and which established a government more just, humane and salutary than the world has ever known; that law which, when disobeyed, brought down the curse of heaven upon its violators, and which, when Jerusalem had finally fallen, was carried in the Roman triumph as the choicest of all the conqueror's spoils, and laid up in the palace of the Roman emperor; that law to-day is more widely known than any law of any lawgiver, ancient or modern, living or dead.

That law has not only wrought its substance into all the legislation of civilization, but it has found its way into barbarous and savage lands. It has been published in more tongues than any other law the world has ever known; and wherever we find truth and righteousness, purity and religion, intellect and intelligence, science and art, discovery and invention, education, order, morality and good government, we find this law has gone before, as a schoolmaster, to bring men to Christ, that they may learn of Him the way of life and peace.

Some of the provisions of Moses' law were of local

application and are obsolete; some of its requirements could only be observed by the Jewish nation in their own land; some of its precepts have reference to circumstances and conditions which have ceased to exist; but the principles and substance of the moral precepts, the hygienic and sanitary prescriptions, and the general tenor of the Mosaic law, survive all past changes; and the books of Moses are to-day well worthy the attention of every candid, honest, upright, and thoughtful man.

Under the influence of that law, notwithstanding all the discouragements and difficulties of its present condition, the Jewish nation still maintains its existence and manifests its power; and the gospel of Christ, which had its origin in the Jewish nation, and was an outgrowth of the Mosaic law, and a fulfillment of Jewish prophecies, is spreading as it has spread for centuries, and is an instrument of blessing to a world which without it would be dark as the shadow of the tomb. Shall not all those who say with the Psalmist, "Oh, how love I thy law! it is my meditation all the day," learn also to look to Him of whom Moses in the law and prophets did write, who came not to destroy the law but to fulfill it, and who Himself is the end or object of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth?

To-day the Jewish people are in dejection and darkness, notwithstanding to them were committed the oracles of God. They need something more than a law which brings condemnation and death to the guilty; they need a Saviour, to turn away transgression from Jacob, and bring redemption to Israel. They need that promised Seed of Abraham who should bless the world, that seed of David who is given for an ensign to the nations, and a leader and commander of the people.

If the scattered sons of Israel who so often pray, "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things

out of thy law," could fully comprehend the force and meaning of that revelation which was committed to their fathers, they might learn that these long ages of suffering and chastisement which they endure are the direct result of a long-continued rejection of that Prophet whom Moses foretold, who was to be like unto himself, and whom they were to hear in all things. Oh that even now, notwithstanding their revolt, they would accept the promise of divine blessing, and, forsaking their unbelief, look on Him whom they have pierced, and mourn for him as one mourneth for his only son! Then they might say with the prophet who described the sufferings and sorrows of Him who grew up before the Lord "as a tender plant," but who was despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with griefs,—"Surely He hath borne *our* griefs, and carried *our* sorrows; yet did we esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all."

When repentant Israel, taking on their lips these words which their own prophets have spoken in the name of the Lord, shall turn to Him from whom they have departed, and by whom they have been chastised, they will find that he is still favorable to his land, and merciful to his people. Oh that the scattered nation, for so many years without a king, a priest, an altar, a sacrifice or a sin-bearer, may soon learn to look upon their own suffering Messiah, as the "Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," and "seek the Lord their God, and David their king; and fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days." Hosea iii. 5.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: June 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 381 216 9